

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1868.

---

ART. I.—DORNER'S HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.  
[SECOND ARTICLE.]

---

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

---

THE Second Book of Dr. Dorner's work is devoted to what he calls the *Sonderleben* of the two Protestant Confessions, and the *Wiederauflösung* of the original principle of Protestantism. The period embraced in it reaches from the first part of the seventeenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches, originally and constitutionally different forms only of the same general movement, more or less conjoined in their actual previous history, are regarded as now falling asunder, and running each a separate course through several generations; an intermediate historical stadium, which must be considered in this view unsatisfactory and wrong, while it served, however, to prepare the way for the ultimate union of the Confessions again, as it may be trusted, in the power of a higher and better life. It is characteristic, then, of this period of sundered existence still farther, that it was attended also with a sundering of the proper Protestant

consciousness itself on the part of both Churches. The unity of the original Protestant principle (as at once material and formal), underwent a gradual dissolution, resulting at last in the reduction of the principle under both views to sheer weakness and inanition. This also, however, must be taken as a transitional stage of church life, designed to make room for the restoration of what was the proper idea of Protestantism in the beginning; and the great theological problem for the present age, accordingly, is to re-assert, both practically and theoretically, the original Protestant principle in its full compound force, in a way that shall place it triumphantly above all the errors that have attended its wrong development, down to the present time.

Only in this way, Dorner thinks, is it possible to vindicate "either the justice of the Reformation itself in the sixteenth century, or the right of Protestantism now to look upon itself as having any legitimacy from that great revolutionary movement." Mere outward succession here, in other words, is not enough; without the bond of a common life, without comprehension in the principle of the Reformation as a positive actual force, the boast of lineal descent can mean nothing. Without this, all comes at last to poor empty negation; and Protestantism has no history which is not at the same time the argument of its own unsubstantial existence.

The Birth-Period of Protestantism, the age of confessional production, was followed in both divisions of the new Evangelical Church by an age of scholastic theology, in which every effort was made, with vast outlay of strength and learning, to organize the religious material of the Reformation into full scientific form; whereby it might appear in proper harmony with itself, and be properly distinguished, at the same time, from the errors of Rome in one direction, as well as from all false irreligious extremes in the other. It lay in the very nature of this school divinity, that it should stand in a certain sort of outward opposition to the original freshness and vigor of what it was required to study and explain; and we find throughout a tendency with it, accordingly, to substitute the

theory of religion, in some measure, for the actual life of religion. Orthodoxy was made to stand too much for the whole sense of Christianity; in which wrong position, then, it failed to secure its own object, and became itself unfaithful to the very cause it was intended to support. Especially was this the case in regard to the main citadel of Protestant Christianity, the right union of the material and formal sides of the original principle of Protestantism. All here depended on the living relation of faith to the word of God as comprehended primarily in Christ Himself, and could be firmly and steadily held only in the element of the actual life to which it belonged. As an object of mere reflection or outward scientific contemplation, the mystery is found to become more or less unsteady; its two sides lose their necessary coherence; faith no longer carries with it its own rightful assurance; and then the word, also, turned into a simply mechanical authority, is shorn of its proper power, and proves unequal altogether to what is required of it, as taken to be now in such abstract view the pillar and ground of the truth.

In this portion of his *History*, our author directs his attention first to the Reformed Church. The reign of orthodoxy here, or what he calls "one-sided objectivity," is made to reach to about the close of the seventeenth century. The Reformed theology of this period comes before us under a most respectable and imposing character; passing from Switzerland over to Holland, strengthening itself in different parts of Germany, flourishing for a time in France, and finally attaining to credit and distinction also in England. Holland became famous throughout the world for its universities and great theological names. The Synod of Dort, claiming to be of oecumenical authority for the Reformed Confession, made the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination to be a necessary part of its orthodox faith. But this met with much opposition; not only in Germany, through the influence of Lutheranism, but also in Holland, France, and England, by a reaction from within the bosom of the Reformed Church itself. All this gave rise to great controversies; in the course of which the material and formal sides

of the Protestant principle both suffered damage, in a way that made room finally for a general irruption of rationalistic unbelief. The old orthodoxy, held up for a time in Switzerland by the *Consensus Helveticus*, gave away at last in full about the year 1700, making an end of this whole scholastic period for the Reformed Church at large.

Of special importance as a reactionary force against the scholasticism of the period, was the celebrated school of Cocceius (J. Cock), an eminent German divine, whose labors in Holland told with immense effect for a time on the theology of the whole Reformed Church. To understand his position, and what he accomplished in this view, it is necessary to glance at what had come to be the general theological posture of the Protestant Church in his time.

The circumstances of Protestantism, according to Dorner, necessitated in the progress of its development a resort to philosophical scholasticism, for its own explanation and defence. The two Confessions, however, applied their studies here in different ways. The being of God (theology in the strict sense), they accepted in common without any original inquiry; then, however, while the Lutheran theology directed its attention to Christ's benefits (justification in particular), as the marrow of the Gospel, the thinking of the Reformed Church fastened itself mainly, not, indeed, on God's being, as now said, but on God's decree, in such manner as to see all history comprehended in it, as it were *sub specie æternitatis*, without room for any real human agency whatever. Under such unchangeable constitution, there could be no resolution of history into great periods or ages ruled by different principles; even the fall of man itself could form no such distinction, but must be considered the coming out simply of what was required by God's decree from the beginning, for the accomplishment of its ultimate purpose. God is in full harmony with Himself through all, looking to the end of all from first to last, the salvation of the elect through Christ. History in such view, of course, ceases to be history in any proper sense of the term. Human freedom has nothing to do with it. It involves no real movement whatever.



But the want of a proper historical view of religion was not confined in this period to the Reformed Church. "The Lutheran scholasticism also," Dr. Dorner tells us, "failed to reach the idea of an actual history of redemption, including periods and stages, for humanity at large; all it recognized was such history in the case of single souls, whose salvation then was made to turn, not on God's decree, but on His truth made known for the purpose through revelation. This truth must be the same, it was assumed, for all times; and therefore salvation was at hand for men under the Old Testament, before Christ came into the world, in the same form in which it is at hand for them now, since His coming, under the New Testament. In this we see at once a tendency to one-sided intellectualism in the conception of saving faith, and at the same time a general want of clearness, as in the age of the Reformation itself, in regard to the relation of the Old Testament to the New. For, keen as Luther's observations frequently are in this direction, particularly where he contrasts the Law with the Gospel, it did not come still with him or with the Church at large, as his own commentaries on the Old Testament show, to the firm apprehension of any real difference of religion under the two dispensations. The Form of Concord says indeed what is true, when it tells us, that the Gospel is to be found in the Old Testament, and the Law also in the New Testament; but if we are to allow at all the force of our Lord's own distinction of periods (Matt. xi. 11, 12), this must not be so taken as to trench too closely on the absolute newness of Christianity. The identification of the two dispensations in the Lutheran Church, doing away with the idea of historical development, and raising the Old Testament at once to the level of the New, found support in the hypothesis that the Old Testament saints saw Christ and His work of salvation prospectively by faith; and that as for the unchanging nature of God, all history is comprehended in a single glance, causing the future to be felt as present, so the historical value of the atonement also must be allowed to carry with it in this way a retroactive force. This view was promoted largely, moreover, by the reigning doctrine of inspi-

ration, which made God to be the exclusive and sole author of the Scriptures (without any recognition of a true human concurrence in their production), and then, as all sound interpretation must aim at giving the *full* sense and mind of an author, was led irresistibly, out of regard to the immutability of God's purposes and counsels, to seek in the Old Testament also what were known to be the truths of the New Testament; as being necessarily the only whole and adequate expression of God's meaning in His own revelation, and capable of being apprehended as such, at least by true believers."

In this way, we are told, the Lutheran theology, no less than the Reformed, failed to reach in the seventeenth century the conception of a real, living historical movement in the work of the world's redemption. But the identifying view of the Old and New Testaments was aggravated somewhat perhaps, and made more mechanical, in the Reformed Church, by the stress which was laid there on the absolute sovereignty of God, in connection with the doctrine of predestination.

Keeping all this in view, we may understand the significance of Cocceius and his "theology of the covenants." He stood in the bosom of his time; moved in the Reformed system of thought; and found Christianity, himself, quite too indiscriminately in the Old Testament. But his heart was warmly in the Bible, and his studies here carried him out of the beaten track of the schools. The great business of theology, in his view, was to ascertain the mind of God in the Scriptures. He has been charged with teaching that the sacred text must be taken to mean all that it can in any way be made to mean; but his view was simply that the sense of the text, in any case, is not to be limited or measured by what was in the mind of its human composer. For the whole authorship of it being of God, according to the common orthodox judgment, the wholeness of God's knowledge with regard to its subject, must be considered as entering into it; so that whatever it can be made to mean by this standard, must be counted as belonging in truth to its legitimate sense. Under this general view, theology became in his hands altogether biblical; and the idea around which it

revolved was that of the covenant. Others before him had made much also of this idea, particularly Olevianus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism; but it was under a one-sided view mainly, as seeing in it only a relation of God to man. Cocceius first made earnest with the double character of the relation, as depending on conditions, involving acts, and carrying along with it the force of real history. This was at once to unsettle the doctrine of an abstract decree, made to be the principle of the world's salvation in the Calvinistic sense. Not only the supralapsarian scheme of necessity, but the infralapsarian also, was made to bend and give way more or less before such a view. It was an immense matter to have the feeling of a historical process, the sense of differing economies brought home to the consciousness of the Church in this way. No wonder that the scholastic orthodoxy of the time felt itself disturbed by what was felt to be so serious a breaking away from its authority. Its controversies with the Cocceian theology, reaching through many years, while they were successful to a certain extent in exposing the defects of this scheme, served at the same time to bring out the inherent weakness of the reigning theology, and helped on the reactionary tendency which robbed it finally of all its force, and caused it to give way entirely to the subjectivism and rationalism that carried all before them in the course of the following century.

Our author finds in the Cartesian philosophy another far-reaching cause which, in his opinion, wrought powerfully and deeply, as a silently undermining force in the same revolutionary direction.

After noticing in such general way the course of theology in the Reformed Church on the Continent, Dr. Dorner passes to the consideration of its history during the same period in Great Britain. Here there might seem to have been, at first view, no movement in common with the continental life of the Confession. But we have, in fact, the same general law at work, our author thinks, on both sides; only under a difference of character, answerable to their different spirit and genius. What we have on the Continent predominantly in the form of thought and in-

tellectual production, meets us in England and Scotland in the form of will, practical production, external organization, political and social life; with special regard also in England more particularly, to all that pertains to cultus or public worship. In neither of these countries, we are told, has a scholastic theology, or rigidly scientific orthodoxy, ever been able to strike root. The idea of objective religious authority has, instead of this, embodied itself in real outward arrangements and constitutions; over against which, then, the heterodox has run always naturally to like outward expression in the form of church separation and schism. These practical activities, however, are only in their way what the theoretical activities show themselves to be in another and different way. History as a whole, in both cases, turns on the relation of authority to freedom, as these oppositional forces are found incessantly struggling, through all antagonisms, to reach some satisfactory reconciliation and peace. Thus we have the idea of authority in Great Britain represented under the form of an established church polity, Episcopalianism in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland. The ecclesiastical struggle between the opposing forces here corresponds in some measure with the confessional war on the Continent; as it ends also in a sort of like general exhaustion and dead formalism on both sides, making room for the insurrection of private judgment and private will, in a way that brought on finally a reign of general unbelief. The reaction of the subjective principle against objective authority, gave rise to the Independents or Congregationalists, to the English Baptists, to the Quakers, and other unsacramental sects; and then finally, also, to the Deists. Deism rose in England during the latter part of the seventeenth century, and flourished steadily on till about the middle of the century following. In Scotland, the inward course of things was substantially the same. The old church orthodoxy sank into lifeless formality, and there also, as everywhere else, the eighteenth century became a period of wide-spread scepticism and unbelief.

In the Lutheran Church, the parallel historical movement through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, according to

Dr. Dorner, is of a more measured and regular character; carried forward by parties, which were held together always in the same ecclesiastical communion, and which found themselves forced in this way to come to a more thorough understanding of their differences. Here we have again, in the first place, a period of one-sided objectivity, a time of scholastic orthodoxy, devoted to the work of expounding and defending theologically, on all sides, the religious acquisitions of the previous age, as they were held to be embodied particularly in the Lutheran symbolical books. The great matter was to hold fast, and hand forward safely, the traditional faith received from the Reformation fathers. It was, for Germany, an age of famous theological schools and mighty theological men.

Specially deserving attention here is the history of the Reformation principle. It underwent gradually serious modification and change. For Luther, as we have seen, faith and word (the subjective and objective sides of the principle) were indissolubly joined together, though each had still its own relative independence; the direct apprehension of the Christian salvation itself in Christ, was that which authenticated the truth of Christianity; and the assurance of this truth, therefore, was not the result, in the first place, of any divine certification of the biblical canon, but came simply from the laying hold of what forms the matter of the Bible, the gracious doings and promises of God, and, above all, the great fact of justification through faith. This article of justification, then, was not with him one simply among other doctrinal propositions; it lay at the root of the whole Christian life itself, as well as at the foundation of all Christian doctrine. In the seventeenth century, now, we find the demand for unconditional certainty in religious things still actively in force among German theologians; a demand, that could not be satisfied without reaching directly to the highest source of evidence, as it is found only in God Himself. It was not considered enough to set the testimony of the Scriptures above the outward authority of the Roman Church; this testimony itself must not be a mere outward authority, but must be received as an inward personal assurance wrought in the soul



by God. So teach in harmony with Luther and Chemnitz, we are told, John Gerhard, Hülsemann, König, Calovius, Dannhauer, Dorsch, Quenstedt, and Hollaz. Neither do these great writers mean to treat Christian truth as a merely theoretic interest, or to sunder the knowledge of it from the sense of its saving power; theology they hold to be a practical state of mind (*habitus practicus*) directed toward eternal salvation. We cannot say, therefore, that the union of the formal and material principles which formed the pivot of the Reformation, was altogether lost sight of in the seventeenth century. Even where systematic divinity is made to begin with the Bible as its only principle and foundation, it is still always on the assumption that the truth which the Bible teaches has become matter of experience to the theologian, and that he stands through faith in the felt sense and assurance of what he is here called to expound.

So much must be granted; and yet how different the spirit of this seventeenth century is, after all, from that of the Reformation period! In what does the difference consist, then? and how is it to be explained?

According to Dr. Dorner the difference lies in this, that the theology of the seventeenth century no longer held the material principle of the Reformation (the assurance of faith authenticating its own object, God's justifying grace), as of co-ordinate force with the formal principle, the authority of the Bible, but allowed it weight only in the form of dependence on the Bible, and indeed only as its effect and product. This might not seem to amount to much; but it was, in truth, a falling away from Luther's standpoint, which drew after it most serious consequences.

Two polemical references contributed to this unconscious change of base. First, the Catholics held all appeals to personal God-wrought convictions as no better than fantastic private judgment, against which they arrayed then the supposed sure authority of the Church; and so in controversy with them it was felt necessary, instead of standing on any such personal assurance, to have recourse only to what both parties were ready to acknowledge, namely, the divine authority of the Holy Scrip-

tures. Then secondly, however, the Anabaptists and other fanatics, reversing the Catholic view, affected to plant themselves wholly on the material principle (personal assurance); making no account, comparatively, of the formal (Bible authority). So, on this side again, there was a strong motive with the orthodox theologians, to lay all stress upon the Bible; and thus altogether it was that the proper co-ordinate authority of the material factor, as this entered into the original full principle of Protestantism, fell gradually more and more out of sight, while it became more and more an object to establish the divine sufficiency of the sacred canon as in and of itself the only pillar and ground of the truth.

Dorner finds a progressive movement in this one-sided direction throughout the seventeenth century. The deviation from the old view took place by gentle, hardly observable degrees. Hunnius and J. Gerhard go a certain length in making the personal assurance of salvation subservient only to the argument for the authority of the Bible; Calovius, Dorsche, Quenstedt and others, go farther; till finally the "witness of the Spirit" to God's truth is made to resolve itself entirely into the divine authenticity of the sacred canon, and the assurance of what is taught in the Scriptures as *doctrine*, without any regard whatever to the direct appropriation of the truth itself in its own living form. "By this subordination of the assurance of actual grace to the assurance of biblical doctrine and the divine authority of the Scriptures, justification by faith was robbed of its fundamental significance as an argument for the truth of Christianity. For the assurance of grace is simply the certainty of such justification. Another way was fallen upon for the certification of Christianity; namely, the self-authenticating power of the Scriptures themselves through the Holy Ghost dwelling in them, both as to their contents and as to the divinity of their form. Thus deprived of its fundamental force, the material principle of the Reformation could take its place only as one among other articles of faith in the body of the theological science itself; whilst, on the other hand, it became now a settled maxim, that the *Scriptures are the only principle of theology*.

They must, then, be clothed with full qualification for this position, so as to be able to bear up alone the whole weight of doctrinal orthodoxy. It was not enough for them to remain any longer as the trustworthy original record only of the Christian revelation, the fountain of genuine Christian knowledge, and in this way the norm and test for everything claiming to be Christian; they must serve also as the source of evidence for the truth of Christianity itself, and (through the formal use of reason) as the only and all-sufficient means of establishing all theological doctrines. What was taken from the material principle, as witnessing through the direct consciousness of God's justifying grace to the divine character of Christianity, and so to the certainty of Christian truth, was now attributed to the Bible; and the Bible was put forward in such sort, that the whole view taken of its inspiration, as compared with Luther's standpoint, underwent essential change, making it to be, at once, in, and of itself, the self-sufficient, self-upholding, and self-evidencing presence of all divine revelation."

That such change in the central standpoint of the Lutheran Church should make itself felt, more or less seriously, on the progress of its theological thinking at all points, is only what might be expected; we cannot pretend, however, even to glance here at the way in which Dr. Dorner pursues this observation in its details.

The one-sided objectivity of the Lutheran orthodoxy, like that of the Reformed system, called forth opposition, not only from without, but in time also from the bosom of the Confession itself. Modifications of the Protestant principle, at war with one another as well as with the reigning school divinity, but showing jointly the necessity of a more profound and comprehensive construction of Christianity and theology, come into view in the first place, according to our author, under three different general forms. These he makes the subject of separate consideration, under the titles of Protestant *Myticism* (represented by such men as Paracelsus, Weigel, Lautensack, Stiefel, Jacob Böhme, Gichtel, Petersen and Poirer), *Calixtinism* (the Syncretistic school), and *Pietism* (Spener, Bengel, Zinzendorf).

Beautiful in his time stands out to our view the historical figure of George Calixtus, Professor for forty-two years in the University of Helmstedt. Amid the tumult of theological controversy and strife raging on all sides, he conceived the idea of finding in the history of the Church a common ground on which all parties might come together in peaceful union; and to this object, then, all his energies were directed and devoted, causing him to be spoken of as the "regent of his time." Having travelled first through Lutheran countries, he made himself acquainted personally also with Catholic lands and different parts of the Reformed Church. He spent a winter in Cologne, "the Trojan horse of the Papacy in Germany;" visited Holland, then in its glory; and from thence passed over to England. On his return, he became settled at Helmstedt, and continued there till his death, in 1656. His studies and travels widened the horizon of his religious views; made him broadly catholic; disposed him to be in all directions irenic, rather than polemical. The miseries of the intolerant Thirty Years' War confirmed him in this habit of mind. He was fond of Jerome's words: "Christ is not so poor as to have a church in Sardinia only, all Christendom is His." He liked to lay stress on what even in Roman Catholicism is Christian, and tried to put aside or blunt the sharp points that separated the Lutherans from the Reformed, and the Roman Church from both, in order that the spirit of true catholicity might plant itself on the ground of the original faith which was still common to them all. So in different works, whose very titles breathe the soul of concord and peace. He was, after J. Gerhard, the greatest theologian of his age; held in high respect, both in Church and State; a man of most imposing, but at the same time attractive, personal appearance. Altogether a name deserving, as few do, the admiring and loving memory of the world. But, alas, his catholicity met with small favor, and only brought him into difficulty on all sides. Still he was not without vast influence in his generation. His followers formed a widely extended and highly respectable school. He led the way particularly in dogmatic history; and his theology, though not strictly of the creative order, told in-

directly, with more or less effect, against the established system. The tendency of it, however, was more intellectual than practical; and showed itself ready to join hands, accordingly, with the reigning orthodoxy against Spenerism.

This third phase of opposition to church orthodoxy represented the will (as Mysticism represented feeling, and Calixtinism the understanding), and carried with it in the end the greatest power. It brings into view the movement of what is known as Pietism. This falls into two periods or stages; the first reaching to the death of Spener, in 1705, in which it appears as a struggling interest, maintaining itself with more or less difficulty against its foes; the second extending from 1705 to about 1780, when it is found to be the victorious and aggressive side. Pietism was the protest of the practical religious spirit against what had become the dead mechanism and formality of the school divinity, the prevailing orthodoxy of the Lutheran Church. It had, of course, large right on its side; but it fell also into large wrong; and, while it served to expose the weakness of the reigning theology at different points, it failed to bring in any stronger system in his place; so that all was made to totter in the end toward a common fall. The fresh life that was in the movement at the first finally died out, and it became itself only a new mode and phase of the one-sided traditionalism it pretended to oppose. Stereotyped phrases and methodical forms came to stand for the proper power of godliness. Experimental or subjective religion resolved itself, in this way, into a scheme of artificial psychological frames and states, which became then the subject of more or less morbid introspection for the minds of those in whom it was supposed to have place; and a sort of anxious outward legalism was substituted everywhere for the free sense of childhood in the family of God.

"Pietism," says Dr. Dorner, "insisted with right on regeneration and experimental religion, and took the first in a more earnest sense than it had for Orthodoxy; which saw in it only the divine communication of ability to believe, nay, held it to be already accomplished in infant baptism. But Pietism made it to be so much a matter of consciousness, as to leave out of view



the objective basis of antecedent grace, on which alone it is possible for the new life to have any sure or prosperous growth, making no account of the unconscious and natural; and by laying all stress on sensible experience, substituted more and more a sickly habit of reflection and self-examination for the exercise of direct, joyous, childlike faith. This painful self-inspection, however, brooding always over the evidences of personal piety (Have I true faith? Have I experienced the new birth? &c.—a disease that broke out in the Reformed Church also at this time), only served to promote a feeling of inward uncertainty, and a vain reaching after notes and marks of grace, that were often only self-made, and anything but evangelical in the proper sense of the term." The system, as it reigned in Halle, degenerated thus into much inward dishonesty and untruth, became narrow and slavish in its views, ran into censoriousness and spiritual pride, and lost altogether the power of producing free, healthy Christian life. It is a most significant fact, that not a few of the leaders of Rationalism proceeded from this school.

Two other vigorous practical movements in the meantime came forward in support of the Pietistic reaction against the reigning orthodoxy; which, although less extensive than the older school, were destined to make themselves felt with deeper and more enduring force, by throwing off its essential faults and appropriating to themselves, in a way it had not done, the elements of a true church life. These movements stand identified with the illustrious names of J. A. Bengel and Count Zinzendorf.

Bengel rose into view as a star of the first magnitude in the theological world, amid the decline of the older Pietism, both in Halle and elsewhere; and soon became the centre of a new school at Würtemberg, the wholesome influence of which has continued to be felt, through all the intervening years of neology and unbelief, down even to our own time. He was distinguished alike for his warm personal piety and his great learning. His position, at the same time, was altogether independent of Halle, and, whatever kindred spirit he had with Spener,

he differed from him materially in what he aimed at and accomplished for the revival of true religion.

Of still different order again was the practical piety of Zinzendorf, and the great Christian family (*Brüdergemeinde*) of which he became the honored founder. If there was a prophetic significance in Bengel's theology, a divination of much that lay far in advance of his own time, the same must be allowed to hold good also, under a different view, of this new church organization. It was not only a protest, quiet but deep, against the existing state of the Church; it looked beyond it at the same time, and anticipated, as it foreshadowed also, a better order of Christianity in the coming future. The animating soul of the movement was the idea of catholicity, in opposition to all ecclesiastical particularism. No Church, however widely extended, can ignore this idea, without becoming inwardly sectarian and separatistic; and the followers of Zinzendorf, in its faithful representation, fulfilled a high and holy mission for the Church at large, which only the most unchurchly spirit can refuse to honor and admire.

For the theological life of the Protestant Church in general, the spirit of the *Brüdergemeinde* became of vast account first, according to Dorner, through its illustrious pupil Frederick Schleiermacher.

Thus, altogether, it was, that the Lutheran orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, even while it seemed to be strong, by a sort of dialectic process working in its own bosom, prepared the way at last for the general dissolution with which it was overtaken in the following period. The constituents of a sound theology (mystical, intellectual, practical), which the faith of the Reformation had united in itself by a sort of direct genial apprehension, without bringing them still to any clear scientific arrangement and adjustment, gradually fell asunder again—each several factor in succession asserting itself with one-sided force at the expense of the rest; until finally the bond which held them together in the beginning was completely broken, and such a wholesale wreck and confusion ensued, as made it necessary to seek a reconstruction of the entire system under a new and better form.

The catastrophe here referred to was what Dorner calls "the triumph of subjectivity in the eighteenth century." It came close on the heels of the Pietistic controversy, and in a certain sense as its natural result. This seemed to end at first in a sort of general calm, that was supposed to augur well for the interests of religion. Intemperate zeal gave place on both sides to forbearing moderation. "It was," Dr. Dorner tells us, "a comparative bloom-season for Lutheran theology that now came in; and when we consider its leading names, we can hardly help wondering that the Church should have still needed, afterwards, to pass through such sore and terrible trials in the eighteenth century, in order to be restored from the maladies of the time going before. An alliance appeared to have been reached finally between church tradition and zeal for vital godliness, Pietism and orthodoxy, faith and theological science, which promised to be at once prosperous and enduring. But this bloom-season was quickly over; it served simply to usher in the negative criticism, which soon after took entire possession of German theology."

To this season of calm before the coming storm (the Indian summer of the old supernaturalism), belong such names as Gottfried Arnold, Weismann, Pfaff, J. G. Walch, Fabricius, Cyprian, Salig, Buddeus, and Mosheim—men distinguished particularly for their historical studies. Take Mosheim, in particular, as an example of the age: "The accomplished and learned chancellor had a thorough knowledge of English, French, and Italian literature. He wrote against Toland his *Vindiciæ antiquæ Christianorum disciplinæ*, 1720. His other historical works are: *Instit. hist. Eccl.*, 1726; *De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M. commentarii*, 1753; and a volume on *Michael Servetus*. He had a rare talent for reproducing dogmatic systems, and wrote also a small doctrinal work of his own, as well as a system of biblical ethics in five quarto volumes, 1735-53. He shows no sympathy with the rigoristic or ascetic views of Halle; inclines, on the contrary, to the eudæmonistic scheme, and a certain philosophical eclecticism put forward in choice, tasteful language, suited to recommend reli-

gion to good society. As an ecclesiastical historian, he moves no longer in the solemn patristic style, or with the tone of a preacher of righteousness; he is the sleek abbé of church historians, with a strong dash of worldliness about him in all his ways. Without any deep sense of religion, he has for the specific life and doctrine of the Church, nay, for the very idea of the Church itself, neither eye nor understanding. It is for him simply a human society, which he is fond of considering (territorialistically), as of one order with the State. He is impartial and faithful to facts; but church history is not in his view a proper life-movement of the Church itself, proceeding from its own principle; it is only a record of the fortunes, which have befallen Christianity from external causes and powers. Movements and changes of doctrine he finds occasioned only by heresies, attacking the Church from outside foreign, especially philosophical standpoints and principles—or, in part, by the necessity, common to all communities, of having fixed laws (here catholic dogmas), for the maintenance of their general life. That the principle of Christianity is itself historical, a force generating evolution and formative movement both in doctrine and life, never entered into his mind. For him also, therefore, Christianity is something more stationary than progressive; all idea of historical movement as concerned with it falls over rather to the side of the powers the Church had to contend with beyond itself, and on these accordingly he bestows his main interest. In one word, Church history, with Mosheim, is a pathology of the Christian Church, more than a record of its actual life."

The fair show that now prevailed, more or less in this spirit, on all sides, was hollow everywhere and sadly delusive. Confidence in the old theological traditions had come to be shattered more than was commonly imagined. The forms of orthodoxy were still honored with decorous outward respect, but their animating spirit was gone; and an ill-concealed sense of weakness betrayed too often the cause it undertook to defend. With a presentiment of what was coming, much was done by the friends of the Church to fortify it outwardly against the

assaults of infidelity. As the Deistic period in England was the age at the same time of Christian Apologetics, which served only, however, to help forward the cause of Deism itself, so now, in Germany also, one of the most significant signs of the growing eclipse of faith, is the way in which pains were taken on every side to prop up the trembling cause of Christianity. The Christian argument became mechanical, and was everywhere a compromise more or less with the skeptical humor it sought to propitiate and convince—an *apology*, of a truth, in the modern, rather than in the old classic sense of the term. It was found necessary to make concessions, to part with old terminology, to qualify what were felt to be extreme positions; but this was done, without reaching any new ground, from which such modifications could be admitted in full harmony with the Christian principle; it was done in such a way as to meet the party to be propitiated on its own premises; and the consequence was, that the new orthodox theology, thus circumstanced, had no power whatever to make any effectual stand against the enemy with which it was called to contend. It was in one boat with the enemy, indeed, without being aware of the fact.

It is a very interesting and suggestive picture, which Dr. Dorner gives us of this rationalistic orthodoxy, on the threshold of the neological revolution of the nineteenth century; a picture well worthy of being held up as a mirror, for the serious contemplation of much that claims to be the best style of Protestant theology, here in America, at the present time.

"This theology," he tells us, "had not properly any new positive principle, to actuate and control its modifications; there was nothing creative in it, no power of production. The robe in which it went about was pleasing; but it was not a theology that touched the root of the evil it was intended to correct. For it did nothing of any account, to bring revelation and the rational nature of man near to each other; to bring into view the need and longing there is in the last for the first; and then, also, the quickening and fructification there is in the first for the second; the friendly relation, in a word, of revela-



tion to reason. As regards *reason*—the Aristotelian and scholastic methods having fallen into discredit as pedantic and lifeless, without any other yet pretending to take their place—it favored a certain loose eclecticism, of no fixed principle or plan, in which all turned on private taste or common popular understanding. *Revelation*, on the other hand, had turned itself for the most part into the very reverse of its own idea; it was made to mean *mystery* (in the sense of non-revelation). Times of unfruitfulness in theological science are always ready to take refuge in the mysteriousness of Christianity, and the abused maxim of “leading captive every thought to the obedience of faith;” not considering that what has absolutely *no* place in the understanding can hold a formal relation only to the authority under which the mind is required to bow, while it implies indifference, in fact, toward the specific reality of the truth itself; so that such faith can no longer be the mother of true, positive, fruitful knowledge, but is a falling back from the Protestant position to the Roman Catholic. For the view in question does not mean simply that the natural reason cannot of itself understand divine things truly, nor yet that the depths of God are unsearchable and past full finding out even for the illuminated Christian reason (which would be strictly evangelical); it amounts to the absence of all desire to penetrate progressively, even in a measure, the wisdom of God’s ways. It had contributed not a little to this resigned and indolent view of the mysteriousness of revealed religion, that in certain weighty doctrines (as of Christ’s Person, the Trinity, the Atonement, the Holy Supper), the course of theology had involved itself in difficulties, out of which it could extricate itself at best only by the assertion, that the impossibility and inward contradiction of what they taught could not be proved. From the fact of revelation itself, orthodoxy had severed itself by its world of logical conceptions, and lost finally all sense for the living realities of Christianity. We cannot say that this was helped materially by the interest that now began to be taken in historical studies. The historical feeling did not reach yet to the Scriptures themselves; they were looked upon still, as before,

not simply as being the original record of Divine revelation, but as being the very fact of revelation itself; they took its place. Faith in the Bible was made to be Christian faith. Modifications of the theory of inspiration, such as Pfaff proposed, brought here no change. On the contrary, the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit for the Scriptures (contents and form alike) was weakened, by being made to refer only to the instruction and edification which were supposed to be contained in the words of the sacred volume. Exegesis, in the hands of such men as the elder Michaelis or J. C. Wolff, remained as before."

The theology of the time, in this way, was without inward strength. Then there was a growing disaffection abroad toward Christianity and the Church. Men's minds were unsettled on the whole subject of religion. The study of the natural sciences, in particular, became widely prolific of religious questionings and doubts, and gave a materialistic turn to the general thinking of the age. The very air of Europe had become all at once impregnated, as it were, with the spirit of unbelief. "It seemed," says Dorner, "as if the European race, especially in England and France, had now first opened its eyes to nature and her fixed laws, and those who surrendered themselves to this tendency lost more and more all sense for the independent existence and reality of spirit; the idea of God Himself paled more and more before their empirical and sensuous thinking, and they were borne irresistibly toward the materialism and eudæmonism, which were preached by De la Mettrie, von Holbach, d'Alembert, and other encyclopædists. All this, indeed, was still in a measure strange and repugnant to the German mind; it clung to its ideal character, in spite of the growing importation of English and French literature. But already the so-called *Aufklärung* (illumination), found here also its fore-runners and heralds, in such men as Thomasius, K. Dippel, and Edelmann, the first of whom especially exerted a far wider influence than any of the theologians."

It was the age of Wolff's philosophy; which, with its dry mechanical method, was any thing but favorable either to earnest

spirituality or to deep religious thought. There was a prejudice against it at first among theologians; but this gave way to a friendly feeling, when it was found capable of being turned to good account, as was supposed, in theological argumentation. Its argumentative power, however, lay wholly in the sphere of the common understanding, and intellectual processes were substituted by it for the living evidence of faith. So toward the middle of the century we have eminent Wolffian supernaturalists (Büttner, Carpov, Reinbeck, Reusch, J. E. Schubert, Baumgarten, and others), who, while laboring to bring about a full union between theology and philosophy in this form, only betrayed in fact the citadel they were called to defend, into the hands of its enemies, by placing themselves on common ground with them in their rationalistic premises. Religion, with this respectable school, was held to be *modus Deum colendi et cognoscendi*, a method of knowing and serving God, a certain amount of theory for the understanding and rule for the will, but without any independent existence of its own. Faith thus was demonstrable like a theorem in mathematics. The witness of the Spirit (*Testimonium spiritus s.*), lost its old sense, and became now, if spoken of at all, only the testimony of common experience to the salutary influence of Bible truth. Hence the felt necessity of having recourse to outward intellectual proofs for the Divine authority of the Bible and the truth of Christianity; which were sought then, partly under a speculative, and partly under a historical form. Starting from what we know of God, and of the fallen condition of the world, through natural reason, the argument in the first form dwelt on the need of a Divine revelation, on the possibility of it, and on the notes and criteria that must be expected to attend it—one main peculiarity being, of course, the presence in it of mysteries, that is, truths above and beyond all knowledge. With these criteria now the Bible was found to agree; and so the *quod erat demonstrandum* followed: The Bible is the inspired source and principle of all Christian truth. This is palpably unsatisfactory. Reason thus reasoning out of itself the fact of a Divine revelation above itself, is at bottom a contradiction in terms.

Other representatives of the Wolfian school therefore (such as Storr, Süskind, Flatt, &c.), threw themselves on the historical method of proof. Here we meet the chain of evidence, so familiar still to a large part of our American theology, by which what begins as simply human faith in the Scriptures has been supposed to rise logically to the character of Divine faith. First, the authenticity and integrity of the New Testament canon; next, the credibility of the writings; then, the evidence in them (through His miracles and otherwise) of Christ's truthfulness and Divine mission; then farther, the inspiration of His apostles, and so of the New Testament, guaranteed by His word; and so, finally, the inspiration of the Old Testament also, established by the witness of the New; the whole process ending thus in what is taken to be an infallible assurance that the Scriptures are the infallible word of God, and so in and of themselves immediately and directly the ground of all revealed truth. All stress was laid in this way on the formal principle of Christianity, with almost no account whatever of the material principle; the simply intellectual argument, on historical and rational grounds, being held sufficient for the full verification of its supernatural character and claims. Reason, it was supposed, could in this way demonstrate the presence of revelation, and settle its credibility, on the outside, as it were, of the fact itself. But who may not see, that Christianity, in such view, must descend into the order of mere natural reason, and lose its strictly supernatural character altogether? The whole standpoint is inwardly rationalistic.

As a matter of course, this way of looking at Christianity made itself felt on all theological doctrines. The Wolfian supernaturalism was essentially Deistic (not properly *Theistic*, in the true Christian sense), in its view of God's relations to the world. It had no idea of a Divine immanence in the world, regarded either as a constitution of nature or as a constitution of grace. All was mechanical, external, and hopelessly dualistic. Hence Pelagianizing views of original sin, and of the nature of redemption; of the Church, as a mere voluntary human association; of grace, as an outward assistance simply to the moral

powers of humanity working in its own different sphere. Hence, also, a Nestorian view of Christ's person, of inspiration, and of the atonement; such a sundering of the Divine from the human, as made all to be human finally and nothing more. The old Lutheran Christology was completely given up. The mysteries of Christianity, held in an outward way only, and not as having any thing to do with the proper life of Christianity, grew to be a dead weight which it was found increasingly difficult to carry; and theology, falling in with the reigning spirit of the age, lost all firm hold upon the proper world of faith, and yielded itself more and more to the power of the present world. Thinking everywhere became *popular*, as it was called; that is, mechanical, materialistic, shallow, and flat. All things in heaven and on earth were measured by the scale of utilitarian reference to the wants of the present life. Now come in the so-called popular or practical dogmatic systems (J. P. Miller, 1785; J. J. Griesbach, 1786; Less, 1779; A. J. Niemeyer, 1792; Ammon, 1797), based on the view that Christianity is wholly for practice, and that Christian teaching, therefore, should have nothing to do with what is unpractical and merely speculative; to which category must be referred, then, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Two Natures of Christ, Original Sin, the Atonement, and Justification by Faith. Such was the downward tendency of what still claimed to be the orthodox theology of the age, while it was rushing everywhere, in fact, toward full neological platitude and unbelief.

In this course of things, however, a new movement, not theological in the common sense, but exegetical and historical altogether, and having for its object the determination of what Christian doctrine was in the beginning in distinction from its present form, had come forward with great power, and was now bearing all things its own way toward the most far-reaching, and, at the same time, most unexpected results. At the head of this movement stand Ernesti and J. S. Semler.

Ernesti is the father of the modern grammatical New Testament interpretation. His exegetical manual, translated by the late Professor Stuart, of Andover, has been widely used as a



text-book in our American Theological Seminaries, with little or no sense, apparently, of its dangerous character. It is based throughout, however, on the Rationalistic assumption that the Bible, without any regard to the self-authenticating substance of what it proclaims, is itself the entire fact of revelation, and, as such, capable of being understood and expounded by natural reason, like any other book, without the help of any special illumination whatever. The study of exegesis led naturally to the idea of a biblical theology, in distinction from the ordinary dogmatics.

Ernesti's grammatical interpretation was of itself also historical interpretation; but it is through Semler, more particularly that this method of exegesis and theology comes fully into view, shaking the old order of religious thought at last to its very foundations. Semler was in every way an extraordinary man; all the conflicting forces of his time seemed to meet together in his person; but they were in him without order, a wild, tumultuating chaos, which he had no power to reduce to any harmonious or consistent form. He represents thus the breaking up of his own time, a process needed for the coming in of a better time afterwards, without, however, harbingering at all in any positive way its desirable advent. "It is placing him altogether too high," says Dorner, "when he is spoken of as the father of the later theology in general. Historical criticism forms in this theology but a single factor, nay, nothing more, indeed, than a mere preliminary. He himself came here to no clear, sure principles, or firm results. By bringing the historical element into theology, it is true, he exercised a lasting influence. While the older theology looked upon doctrine as something complete from the beginning, saw in the biblical canon a settled whole beyond all criticism, held the Old Testament to be essentially and directly of one order for the ends of Christian instruction with the New, and had no sense of a revelation moving forward in sacred history from one stage to another; Semler broke the way for a historical view of all these questions, by bringing them up again, and so forcing the uncritical habit of the time to make room for what was here the

more free spirit of the Reformation. Still, taking him altogether, Semler's work was immediately negative far more than positive, a work of destruction far more than a work of creation." With all his historical studies, he had no organ for the right apprehension of history, no sense for its true genetic and teleologic character. It was for him a mere flow, a restless succession of events, in which he saw no abiding substance, no unity in the midst of change, no determination whatever to any fixed end. It had no meaning for him; it served only to destroy all objective landmarks for his faith, and swept him from his traditional moorings out into a sea of general uncertainty and doubt, where he found himself without either compass, rudder, or sail. In all this, however, he was but an image and type, in a certain sense, of the foundering theology of his time.

The general collapse of faith, and the growing triumph of neological illumination (*Aufklärerei*), came into view now through the portentous appearance of such men as Samuel Reimarus (in the infamous *Wolfenbüttel* Fragments), Moses Mendelssohn, Nicolai, Gedicke, Teller, Steinbart, Eberhard, and the low-minded Bahrddt. "A deistic atmosphere," says Dorner, "seemed to have settled upon that generation, and to have cut it off from all living communion with God. To rest with cold understanding and self-satisfied choice in the present world, without a thought beyond it, was considered to be true wisdom and the soundest exercise of reason. Religion became morality simply, while morality resolved itself into a scheme of prudential eudæmonism, in grosser or finer form. All turned to reflection and reasoning; for originality and ideality there appeared to be no longer any organ whatever." There was a difference, of course, among the theological Neologists; all were not equally virulent and rank. But the general malady was wide and deep, and its power remained unbroken out to the end of the century.

Through this whole time of pretended illumination, however, there were not wanting those who might be said, as voices in the wilderness, to have uttered notes, which were not only a

swan-song for the past, but a lark-song also, hailing the approach of a better future. These stand connected more or less with the birth-struggles of a new and more spiritual literature, that was now forcing itself into view, although not always in forms favorable to Christianity. Dr. Dorner devotes a chapter to the consideration of this formless, embryonic religion and theology, in brief notices of Klopstock, Hamann, Lavater, Jung-Stilling, Claudius, Lessing, and Herder. The last two names, in particular, are of special historical significance and importance; but we can only refer to them now in this general way.

While the bands of authority were thus being broken and cast away in other forms, the way was opened for a general revolution also in philosophy, bringing with it still more fundamental changes, through the earnest and profound studies of Immanuel Kant. All the great questions of the time took new form, and demanded new answer, after the appearance of his critical works on the powers of the human mind. The shallowness of the reigning popular philosophy, as it was called, was exposed and put to shame; room was made for deeper views of the moral nature of man; the problems of religion were thrown into new form. The conflict between Christianity and its enemies was brought to turn on deeper and broader issues than before. Rationalism came to a clearer understanding of itself over against supernaturalism, while the dualistic relation in which they stood to each other forced itself more sharply into view, at the cost of all revealed religion. As there had been an attempt before to unite theology with the Wolfian philosophy, so now it was attempted to bring it into union also, first with the philosophy of Kant, and then with the systems of Fichte and Jacobi; answerable to which, we have still what may be called a change of base and tactics on the side of the enemy, and so new forms of assault and defence on the part of the opposing powers. We have the battle fought, in this way, first on the intellectual, then on the moral, and finally on the æsthetic or sentimental theory of religion. The issue in the third form was determined by the stand-point of Jacobi. Su-

pernaturalism here (represented by such men as Eschenmayer, Vater, Steudel, Emmerich, Heydenreich, &c.) took refuge in the absolutely unknowable character of eternal truth, resolved all religion into inward mystic divination and feeling, and so parted in fact altogether with the idea of any revelation under an outward historical form. This yielded in a short time to the influence of Schleiermacher; but the proper rationalism of this æsthetic stand-point lasted longer, and has its representatives indeed down to the present time. It claimed to be of a higher character altogether than the so-called "vulgar rationalism" of the Wolfian and Kantian order; but had no power, after all, to get beyond a merely humanitarian and natural view of Christianity. To this class fall the respectable names of Ammon, Hase, Rückert, and de Wette; however much the last was drawn personally toward the historical Christ in the latter part of his life, in spite of his hopeless doctrinal dualism.

We thus reach the close of Dorner's second book, in which he brings the separate life of the two Protestant Confessions down to the beginning of the present century; where the historical movement, by its own dialectic process, lands us at last in a general breaking up of the whole organization of the Protestant faith as it stood before; and we find ourselves face to face, as it were, with a sort of universal spiritual chaos, the contemplation of which may well fill the serious mind with amazement and awe; even though it appear spanned at the same time, as our author believes it to be, with the rainbow of hope, and be felt to carry in its struggling womb the *Regeneration of Evangelical Theology*, which forms the theme of his third and last book.

Thus was it altogether, according to Dr. Dorner, that the dominion and power of the old Protestant Orthodoxy, in Lutheran form, fell before the insurrectionary forces of private judgment, private feeling, and private will, arrayed through a long course of years against its towering strength. Wave after wave, the reactionary tide rolled in upon the mighty theological fortress, breaking its buttresses and sapping its foundations, till finally all gave way, and it lay a vast wreck only in the

surrounding waters. Objective authority, in every form, was forced to yield to the imperious demands of subjective freedom; first, the authority of the Church; next, the authority of all outward revelation; then, the authority even of all inward revelation (in the sense of such men as Semler and Lessing), to make room for the absolute autonomy of the human will, as taught by Kant; and, finally, in certain quarters, to cap the climax, the authority of morality and religion altogether, as held to be of objective force in any shape or form. This was the winter solstice, truly, of unbelief, cold and cheerless in the extreme; but, like the season of advent, it heralded at the same time, we are told, the *annus mirabilis* of a new and better faith. "As in severe sickness the body exerts its inmost life-powers to master the disease, so Protestantism, in the great crisis of its subjectivity, from 1750 to 1800, struggled to throw off from itself all that was felt to be a cause of its own want of freedom, whatever lay upon it as an outward or foreign force simply, refusing all assimilation with its inward life while it yet claimed dominion over it. This outward incubus was not the Divine in itself; but the human form that had been joined to it, which caused the historical to appear as unspiritual, yea, the Divine itself as a foreign force, destructive for freedom whether in thought, feeling, or will. For even the supernaturalism of the time, with its deistic character, had as little power to conceive of the concurrence of reason and Christianity, as it had to bring the true idea of humanity into proper union with the true idea of God. Human science had now, however, transcended this false order of thought; and so the old theology went down into the grave. But the *Christian faith* still remained; nay, came even now to new vivification, promising in its time a new theology also; a result, to which philosophy itself, even in its mainly destructive period, furnished material aid. For foreign and even hostile as this was now to Christianity in its general attitude, it wrought under a higher view, nevertheless, in its service as forming an onward process of thought, in which, with all loss, there was still much gain, in the way particularly of what served to foreshadow the inward correlation of the human and



the Divine, and so of nature and grace. The three phases of subjectivity that met us first under positively Christian form, in Protestant Mysticism, Calixtinism, and Spenerism, meet us here again, in like order, under consciously advanced philosophical form; the mystic brooding tendency represented in such thinkers as Klopstock, Hamann, Herder; the intellectual, in the school of Leibnitz and Wolff; the practical, in the systems of Kant and Fichte, the philosophical counterpart of Spener's Pietism, ending as religious feeling in Jacobi instead of Zinzen-dorf. None of these forms of consciousness, indeed, could stand by itself; each fell short in controversy with the others; still each represented also a true side of the being or idea of man. This whole process now, at the same time, shows close connection with Protestantism, and especially with its inmost law, the material principle of justifying faith. For as this principle offers, or rather requires, self-certainty and freedom holding in God, so the philosophical movement before us (subjective throughout) is based everywhere on the maxim, that whatever is to have power and right over man must be homogeneous and capable of assimilation with his nature, spirit, mind, and will, so as to become for him a personal appropriation and a personal assurance. Even the kindred nature of the human and the Divine breaks into the view of this subjective thinking, where it would itself fain stop in its own position, with what we may call a sort of involuntary surprise. For, while the power of knowing the truth, of willing the good, and of feeling the infinite or Divine, was recognized as not in itself transcending the nature of man, but as belonging to his true being, the two ideas of humanity and Deity were brought together in these several points of conjunction, in opposition to the old notion of their abstract separation; so that it seemed no longer admissible, to conceive of them as mutually exclusive and strange one toward the other. True, the demand for subjective certainty rendered philosophy, in this period, intolerant of all objectivity; but the quick succession of systems in the same line, and their perpetual conflict with one another, allowed no rest; on the contrary, we may say, forced the thinking of the time to reach toward a solution of its difficulties, in some deeper view. Fichte, a remarkable pres-

ence, by pushing the principle of subjectivity to its utmost conceivable extreme, not only shows the necessity of its rebounding into the objective, but through its full analysis brings the principle of objectivity itself also to fundamental philosophical expression. The spirit thus of two epochs appears in him with sharply defined conjunction; one coming after the other, indeed, but in such proximity as to make it plain that only an inward union of the opposing factors could bring their endless, unfruitful conflict to rest, and make room for any further onward movement of philosophical thought."

All this opens before us, as we can easily see, a most interesting field for Christian contemplation. The modern German philosophy, from Kant to Hegel, has not been friendly to Christianity, but for the most part more or less at war with its Divine claims, yet has it been in fact wrestling throughout, in its own sphere, with what is substantially the same question that modern Protestant theology has to do with in the Christian sphere. The philosophical problem is the union of subject and object, of thought and being (*Denken und Seyn*); transferred to the region of actual religious life, this becomes the theological problem (not solved in the age of the Reformation) of bringing to scientific union the material and formal, in other words the subjective and objective principles of Protestantism—namely, the self-certainty of faith on the one hand (*Matt. 16: 16-18*), and the infallible authority of the Holy Scriptures on the other hand (*2 Tim. 3: 15-17*).

#### PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS.

I. The fact of a progressive falling away of Protestant theology and Christianity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from what they were in the sixteenth century, is not to be denied; and whether we may be willing or not to accept Dr. Dorner's view of it in all particulars, it is certain that it took place under the general character at least, and in the general direction, described in his book. The movement was not confined to one Confession or to any single country; it extended to both Communions, the Lutheran and the Reformed alike,

and made itself felt in all lands. It showed itself in this way to be the result of a common law, and the outworking product of some common cause; whose action must be regarded as starting in the religious life of the Reformation period itself. In other words, the movement must be considered as of a plainly historical character; capable, in such view, of being explained and understood, and challenging the most serious and solemn attention of all who take an interest in the present condition of the Church.

The movement involves two grand stages; two contradictory tendencies, so related that the second begins to work while the first is still in full power; works in the bosom of the first as its own recoiling force, till it becomes finally of overmastering strength, and then sweeps all before it in the way of open revolution and change. The first of the two stages is the period of what Dorner calls *one-sided objectivity* (whether in dogma or ecclesiastical constitution); the second is that of *reactionary subjectivity*, ending in the negation of all positive authority in religion (theoretical free-thinking and practical unchurchliness). The first meets us predominantly in the seventeenth century; the second in the eighteenth.

The seventeenth century, in this view, stands in close connection with the sixteenth, the age of the Reformation, and seems to be at first the simple continuation of its religious and theological life. The great object, all round, was to organize and consolidate the faith that was already enshrined in the Protestant symbolical books. But it is easy to see, that this zeal for the conservation of what was thus handed down as true Protestant Christianity, ran soon into a care for its outward form simply at the expense of its inward life. The faith of the sixteenth century was so intellectualized, as to be shorn of its original native vigor and force. We feel that, where we cannot always explain it, in comparing the spiritual life of the older time with the orthodox thinking of the later time. There was a something here in the theology of the sixteenth century, which we find to be wanting in the more elaborate divinity of the seventeenth. So in the Lutheran Church; and so also, full as much, in the Reformed Church.

In the case of the last, the truth of the observation may be verified very readily by a careful comparison of the Heidelberg Catechism, issued in 1563, with the Westminster Catechism brought out in England toward the middle of the century following. Both represent the same faith; but not by any means in the same way. While the orthodoxy of the Westminster formulary is more intellectual, more anxious, more mechanically rigorous and exact, the soundness of the Heidelberg formulary is more emotional, more free, and more full every way of the spirit of actual hearty life. We could hardly have a better exemplification, indeed, of what Dorner makes to be the difference of the two periods in regard to the material principle of Protestantism. In the Heidelberg Catechism, all turns fundamentally on the direct apprehension of the actual substance of the Gospel itself (Jesus Christ, and Him Crucified, as in the Creed), through an exercise of faith which is supposed to be, in such relation to its object, the full verification in itself of what it is thus brought to believe (Qu. 19-23); all this without any reference whatever to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as a starting-point of right belief, although their authority is indirectly recognized everywhere as the necessary formal side of the general Protestant principle. Who may not see, how this squares in full with the original Reformation stand-point both of Luther and Calvin? But what now is the pivot on which all theological certainty is made to hinge and revolve in the Westminster Catechism? Justification by faith is there of course; but no longer as the article of a standing or falling Church in Luther's sense; no longer as the central prop of the whole Christian system, upholding all other doctrines. It is there simply as one among these other doctrines, in the body of the system; which then requires, of course, to be borne up by some other central pillar altogether. This, we are taught at the very outset, is to be found only in the Bible, regarded as the written codex of God's will, "the only rule He has given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him"; which rule we are then required to consult, that we may know "what man is to believe concerning God, and what duties God requires of

man." In other words, we have the formal principle of Protestantism here substituted in full for the material principle; and the whole weight of Christianity is thrown upon the canonical authority of the Holy Scriptures, instead of being made to centre on Christ through the direct apprehension of saving and justifying faith.

The theology of the seventeenth century must be considered in this view, universally, a falling away inwardly (though not outwardly), from the original life of the Reformation; which then drew after it, however, by a sort of logical necessity, a far more serious falling away from itself, as well as from the older faith, in the overflowing rationalism of the eighteenth century. Dorner resolves all this into the dissolution of the original unity of the twofold principle of Protestantism, and the wrong that was thus inflicted on the side which represented the inward freedom of the believer, by making all of the side that represented outward authority; a wrong, which then by a righteous nemesis so reacted upon itself, as to end in the overthrow of this authority altogether, and the full unbinding of the principle of subjectivity in all imaginable forms. How far this may bear close examination, we will not now stop to inquire. Enough, that we know the fact, and are able to bring it under consideration in its general historical connections. The eighteenth century, immediately behind us, was an age of what may be called general religious atrophy; an age of feeble, languishing faith; an age, in which sense and natural reason had come to rule everywhere the thinking of the world, while things unseen and eternal were regarded for the most part as visionary abstractions. Not that all theology and religion were dead; the religious spirit wrought mightily in certain quarters against the reigning power of unbelief. But still the power of unbelief *did* reign, on all sides, in fact; and this not only as open free-thinking and infidelity, but as a secret virus also, that served to poison and weaken the very life of faith itself. There was a malaria of rationalism diffused through the whole religious world. The best piety of the age was of a scrofulous habit; while its best theology went wheezing continually toward its own grave.



II. We may be thankful that we come after the eighteenth century. Our own age is bad enough; but it is certainly better in many respects than its predecessor. The movement of religious negation seems to have run its course; so far at least that it has come to stultify itself, and thus call for the building up again of what it has sought to destroy, while the conditions for such reconstruction are at hand as they never have been before. The great problem for the nineteenth century would seem to be the restoration of faith from the disastrous eclipse, under which it has come down to us from the century going before, and along with this the recovery of theology and religion to some answerable tone of vitality and health.

This implies at once, of course, that our mission is not to follow blindly in the wake of the last century, but rather to throw off its authority, and to strike out for ourselves a new course, in which we may hope to avoid all that we see so plainly to have been its calamity and its curse. Some have a foolish way, when it suits their fancy, of lugging in here the respect which is due to our ecclesiastical fathers, as an argument against any the least deviation from their opinions or practices. But what can we think of more outrageously absurd, than to require that the Church of England should be bound in this way now, or the Church of Scotland, by the latitudinarian liberalism of their respective church ancestries during the last century; or that the Church in Germany now should hold on to the rationalistic supernaturalism of the days of Wolff and Kant, out of reverence, forsooth, for the memory of the many excellent theologians who did their best to uphold the cause of Christianity in that poor way? And can it be any less absurd, seriously we ask, that our American Church at the present time, seeking to solve for herself the great religious life questions of the age, should be required to fall back passively upon the *modus Deum colendi et cognoscendi* (the very sound now irksome), which ruled the schools and text-books of European Protestant Christendom some eighty years ago—under pain of being held disrespectful to her English, Scotch, or German *fathers*, whether in the old world or in the new? No; the demand is prepos-

terous in the extreme. Let these fathers be honored as they deserve. Let the memory of their faith, and piety, and zeal, be sacredly cherished by the Church. Still it is not reason, that, representing even the best religious life of the eighteenth century, they should be held most fit to give absolute tone and law now to the proper religious life of the nineteenth century. We are beyond that "age of reason" (God be praised); and if there be any meaning ever in history, it calls upon us now to break away entirely from what is thus in our rear, and to reach forth unto those things which are before, "that we may apprehend that for which also we are apprehended of Christ Jesus."

But yet with all this, if there be any meaning in history, the eighteenth century cannot be ignored, or thrust aside, as of no account for the new life of religion and theology, which is required to meet the wants of the present age. Whether we accept Dorner's view of it or not, in some way it must be taken as a preparation for the subsequent coming in of a period better than itself; and then it must be regarded as having in itself much, that is required to pass over, as positive or negative condition at least, into the constitution of this better period, so as to make it all it needs to be made. Our age, like every other, is the child, in a profound sense, of the age going before it; and it is only through the immediate past, therefore, that we can hold any living connection with the past at large, so as to be historically full and complete in our own generation.

III. The idea of a resuscitated theology then, in our circumstances, requires something more than a simple return to the theology either of the seventeenth or of the sixteenth century. Dorner is unquestionably right in this view. Universally, we may say, such a simple resumption of an old outlived stand-point, without regard to following time, is an impracticable solecism. The past, in such view, is always modified by the time following it, so as to be forever different from what it was in its own time. There can be no such thing, therefore, as what is called the repristination of a past life; and it is only folly to dream of it anywhere, in any shape or form. No man can repristinate for

himself, in this way, his own childhood or youth. He may remember, but he cannot *be* over again, what he has been thus in years that are gone. Just as little can any nation repristinate a former stadium of its national existence, whether in art, science, politics, or social life. And so is it in full, also, with the life of the world as a whole. It moves through stages, which once gone are gone forever, save in the way of spiritual incorporation into the ongoing movement that leaves their forms behind. Can there be ever a literal resurrection of the buried Grecian or Roman civilization? Can the Middle Ages, as sentimental romanticists have dreamed, be rehabilitated for modern times in their old flesh and blood? Never. The law is universal and unchangeably sure. History cannot return upon itself in such style as this. Its general movement is onward, everywhere and always.

Admit then, as we must, such a falling away of Protestant theology, as Dorner's History shows, from what it was in the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries, and it follows at once of itself that the evil is something which cannot be effectually corrected, by any supposed repristination simply of the religious life and habit either of the one period or of the other. The scholasticism of the seventeenth century carried in its bosom the incipient strife of principles, that in due course of time gave birth to the spiritual licentiousness of the eighteenth century; and the possibility of this strife also lay involved in the still undeveloped life of the Reformation period, as something which could be fairly surmounted only by its being brought to work itself into full view, as it did through the theological consciousness of later times. Can all this process now pass for nothing, that we here of the nineteenth century, with such vast historical movement as an accomplished fact behind us, should be able at all (even if it were desirable) to domiciliate ourselves quietly in the precise scheme of thinking that belonged either to the later or to the earlier of these great Protestant periods? To put the question fairly, is to answer it. No unsophisticated mind can have any doubt in so plain a case.

The theological salvation of the present, then, is not to be

found in a slavish mechanical reproduction of the systematic divinity of the seventeenth century (Rivetius, Gomarus, Maresius Cocceius, Witsius, Pareus, Turretin, Pictet, Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calovius, Barrow, Owen, Goodwin, Howe, &c.), whatever of wealth is still to be drawn from the rich mines here offered for lasting use. But neither is it to be found in making no account of this later divinity, and falling back immediately and directly upon the age of the Reformation, as though all truth were there, and there only. For us now, the age of the Reformation is not really accessible or available for right theological use, except *through* the consequent progress of its life in the following period. We cannot put ourselves abruptly back into its precise modes of existence and thought; and if we could do so, it would be for us certainly no enlargement, but a narrowing rather and weakening of all our religious powers. For this reason, that style of Old Lutheranism is not to be admired which affects to be a literal fac-simile in the nineteenth century of what Lutheranism was in the sixteenth century, holding for a nullity the three hundred years that have passed since in the general movement of the world's life. This surely is to seek the living among the dead. The past can have no real life for the present in that way. And just so in the case of our Reformed Church, whose genius it is especially to be large and free, both in her theology and cultus. There can be for us no such thing as a mechanical going back to the thinking of the Reformation period, either in Switzerland, or Germany, or Holland; as though all right thought on every point began then, and became all at once complete then, in such sort as to admit no possible progress through all following time. The very pretence of it is pedantry; which comes, too, with a particularly bad grace from those, who are all the time harping on the free spirit of Protestantism over against the older traditions of the Catholic Church. It is idle, to talk of honoring the Reformation fathers in this way. We never communicate with their actual life at all, by a simply outward echoing of its forms; but only by entering into its inward spirit. And this we can never do effectually, except as it is brought near to us in forms

answerable to the changed conditions of our own time. Indeed, it is something terrible to think of never getting beyond the issues, which divided the Protestant Confessions in the sixteenth century, and entangled their theology in so many thorny questions on all sides. Are we to be forever *banned*, then, to the doom of this great ecclesiastical disruption, without any the least hope of future common understanding or reintegrated faith? Must Lutheran orthodoxy, and Reformed orthodoxy, be considered so rigidly inflexible in their original nature, so utterly unhistorical in their constitution, as to allow no prospect whatever of their even approaching nearer to each other in the course of history; much less, of their ever becoming united in full as one and the same Evangelical Church? But this is just what *re-pristination* means here, whether on the Lutheran side or on the Reformed side. Let it be *anathema maranatha* then, we say, on both sides. Our Lord is setting before us, surely, a more excellent way.

IV. Through all movement and change, however, Protestantism must remain in harmony, at the same time, with its own original life, and true to its own fundamental principle; and therefore, in any falling away from what it was in the beginning, must have the power of recovering itself again to its first full substance, though not precisely to its first form. This is the necessary argument of its truth; which is to be looked for now, first of all, according to Dr. Dorner, in what he terms the regeneration of evangelical theology, the work to which the Church is called particularly at the present time. Here, of course, all depends on re-apprehending and re-asserting, both theoretically and practically, the *material principle* of the sixteenth century, in a form answerable to the advanced theological conditions of the nineteenth century.

We have seen what this principle was, as it wrought mightily in the first Reformers, against Romanism on one side and Anabaptism on the other. Justification by faith; this so taken, however, as to be an actual laying hold of Christ's atoning righteousness in the person of Christ himself; whereby Christ himself, it was held, became for faith, then, the assuring argu-



ment at once both of his own truth and grace, and also of the believer's interest in the same. In other words, the material principle of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, was so held as to be strictly Christological; the central significance of the atonement was made itself to centre in the life of Him by whom the atonement came, and who of God (as the Heidelberg Catechism, following Paul, puts it), is freely given unto us for complete redemption and righteousness.

But now, taken in this way, the principle of Protestantism falls back simply on what must be considered the original principle of Christianity. It must do so, we see at once, if it is to be received as a true derivation from what Christianity was in the beginning. In the nature of the case, it is true, as the beginning of a new movement in the history of the Church, it was the original Christian principle under one special aspect, supposed to require at the time special, and in some sense, exclusive affirmation. Still, the special principle here could never be valid, except as it was felt to be comprehended in the general principle out of which it flowed; and so it is easy to see how only it can be corrected and brought right, should it be found at any time out of proper course. Any self-rectification of the Protestant principle now, therefore, such as Dorner holds to be necessary for the regeneration of evangelical theology, must be in the way of bringing it to new and deeper radication in the universal Christian principle. So much is abundantly clear; all the Christological tendencies of the age demand it. The doctrine of the atonement, and the article of justification by faith, can be quickened into new life, only through a quickened interest in the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. First the incarnation; then the atonement. That is the everlasting order of the Gospel, and the only true order of all Christian faith.

And yet there are some, who seem to think that the significance of Christ's sufferings and death is imperilled, if the glorious Person of Christ Himself be taken to comprehend in it *more* than this one offering of Himself for sin; that is, if the derivative principle of Protestantism be not so taken as to be

of more profound and broad meaning, than the fountal principle of Christianity itself from which it flows!

Surely, it ought to be self-evident for all, that the Gospel begins in the angelic song: "Unto you is *born* this day a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." The powers of the Christian redemption meet us first of all in the constitution of the Christian Mediator. Christ is the only principle of Christianity. His mediatorial offices and acts, prophetical, priestly, and kingly, derive all their force from what He is as the Incarnate Word, comprehending in Himself the fulness of the Godhead bodily for *all* the purposes of our salvation.

So it is that all true Protestant faith, fastening itself upon the atonement, must be at the same time true Catholic faith, fastening itself, through the atonement, on Christ Himself, in such way that (whether consciously or not), it shall find in Him more than the atonement; nothing less indeed than the radiant tabernacle of God among men (John i. 14), full of all grace and truth. It must be at bottom of one sense with what Peter and his fellow apostles felt to be in Christ *before* His cross and passion: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the Living God."

And to this, we reiterate, it must come also with all our Protestant theology and church life, if there is to be for them any such new birth as Dr. Dorner holds to be the great ecclesiastical problem of this nineteenth century. It is not enough that they be brought to revert to the standpoint of the sixteenth century, through an inward surmounting of the historical dialectics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; to do this effectually, they must be brought to refer themselves also, through this Reformation standpoint, back to the standpoint of the first Christian ages. There can be no full falling back, in other words, on Luther's principle of justifying faith, that shall not now be a falling back in full also on the original Christological groundwork of the Christian faith as we have it set forth in the Apostles' Creed. It will not do to single out here some particular aspect only of the Mediator's Person, in

the way Dorner and others seem disposed to do, as sufficient for the needs of the case. We must have the Christological principle in full, the whole Person of the Mediator, to start with; as knowing full well, that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and that any theology, therefore, whether Protestant or Catholic, which is not built on this basis, is sure to turn out in the end no better than "wood, hay, and stubble." Let the confessionalism of the sixteenth century be required to root itself in the confessionalism of the second, third and fourth centuries, connecting itself through this old *regula fidei* with St. Peter's great confessional act: THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. This is only taking the Confessions of the sixteenth century, Lutheran and Reformed, at their own word. They own, all of them, the authority of the ancient Christian Creeds. Let earnest be made, then, with this fair and good profession. Let the Apostles' Creed, in particular, be made of fundamental, normative force for all later symbols; so that, however they may be found diverging from one another in what comes after this scheme of sound words, they shall all be found at the same time consenting heartily, here at least, in the consciousness of a common faith. Then the way will be open for a regenerated Protestant theology in the fullest sense of the term. Then confessional polemics may be expected to resolve themselves at once into confessional irenics. Then there will be room for the coming in of real catholic fraternization and union among our different denominational Churches, which even to talk of without this must be considered as only so much chattering nonsense. How can it come to real union anywhere, in theology, worship, or ecclesiastical polity, where there is no agreement, to start with, in the premises of what is to be considered true Christianity, no common acknowledgment of "what be the first principles of the oracles of God"?

## ART. II.—INSPIRATION.

BY D. GANS, D.D.

This is the proper place to involve the subject of inspiration. We have already traced, to some extent, the agency of the Holy Ghost in the creation of the world, especially in the creation of form and order, and in the arrangement of the moral laws constituting the moral government of God, which have been made to penetrate and pervade the world, by the power of which, in personal union with the Divine Spirit, it is preserved in order and harmony from day to day.

Still more prominent is this agency in the creation of man, and particularly in the higher and more spiritual parts of his being. While the life of man and the Spirit of God are not to be regarded as the same essentially, as the Pantheist is wont to view them, they dare not, on the other hand, be abstractly sundered, as the Atheist demands. They are, in fact, closely and even vitally related. The life of man is the immediate result of the Divine Breath, and the Divine Breath is the Spirit of God, (Gen. 2: 7.) The highest stage of this life is reached in the form of the human mind. Here it wakes up to self-conscious and personal existence. From this point light goes forth and illuminates every other part of its being, and renders the whole strikingly transparent. All the faculties of the mind, and the relation which they sustain to each other, result directly from the Holy Ghost. The normal order of thought is no more the result of human will or caprice than the order of the world itself. It is in the mind as a necessary law of its own being. Every mind, to act legitimately, is compelled freely to think according to this law, and the conclusions resulting from such thought stand forth as truths which the mind has just as little power wilfully to accept as to reject. True

science carries in it a power greater than our wilful beliefs. Man cannot, without violence to his mental constitution, think *ad libitum*, but he must think according to the law of his mind; and the same law binds him to the conclusions of his thought. This involves order, and order involves freedom. Power to conceive, compare and conclude, originates in the Divine Breath. Every true action of the mind is a continued breathing on its part under the Spirit of God; and whether it receive, or impart, in either case, it clearly exhibits the agency of the Holy Ghost, under whom it acts.

In this original relation of the Holy Ghost to the mind of man, we find the natural basis of inspiration. The form through which the mind takes up the various material of thought, whether from within or without, and the order according to which it proceeds in the investigation of it—both lie in its own original constitution, secured to it primarily and prominently, by the Holy Spirit. Every ordinary action of the mind, in this view, carries with it in some sense, the idea of inspiration. In great talent, where this original order of the mind is strongly marked, inspiration under this form is more elevated in its character, and accurate in its results. The theory of Mr. Morell, and others, which makes inspiration to consist in an "exalted state of the intuitional faculties," is not wholly in error, however far short it may come in reaching the whole truth. Genius always involves inspiration in whatever department it may be found to move. However reckless and wild it may seem to the ordinary observation of men, it is nevertheless governed by the inward law of its own being, and in its action reveals, as far as it goes, a true and real inspiration. It expresses the mental order of the Spirit under its highest natural form. Its directness of vision is truly astonishing. By one effort, often, it brings up the grandest truths from the deepest depths—truths that have been buried for ages, and in one leap it ascends to the most general principles, exhibiting them in the clearest light, and then leaves them to the fruitless criticisms of the ages. We may thus approximate the idea of divine inspiration from the human side, but we can never in this way fully reach it.



It may be difficult, indeed, to ascertain precisely the degree of accuracy that attached to the original action of the mind as it was formed by the Spirit of God. Yet that it was formed for truth, and involved the power, in its natural process of thought, to arrive at truth, we cannot well doubt. That in every case it would have done this in an *infallible way*, is, however, not necessarily involved in its normal condition. Limitation belongs to the human mind as such; and limitation precludes the possibility of seeing objects in all their aspects and relations, at the same time. The human mind, by this law of its own being, is confined to single standpoints; and when one aspect of truth is beheld without its relation to other aspects, which are hidden for the time being, it would be both easy and natural so to exaggerate the part which is perceived, as materially to affect the harmony of the whole and thus involve the power of error and falsehood.

In addition to this, the will, though it also received from the Holy Spirit the law of its action, was nevertheless left free, that is, was left with the power, either to move in harmony with its original order, or to forsake this and select another law of motive and action. The necessity of this freedom lay in the nature of the will itself; and with this freedom of will, it is easy to perceive what a great disturbing power there might be over the ordinary natural processes of the mind, endangering the accuracy both of premises, processes and conclusions. That the will, in its original constitution, actually did possess the power to choose another course from that suggested by the law of its own proper being, is now experimentally evident by the presence of sin, which could only result from a will possessed of freedom, and involving the idea of personal responsibility. With the disturbing power of sin, which has thus become actual and universal in the race, reacting upon the freedom of the will, which is itself a power more or less disturbing the mind fails entirely, now, to inspire confidence in the infallible accuracy of its conclusions. The original order secured to it by the Holy Spirit has been confused; the spiritual light which shone through it, originally, illuminating its action and inspir-

ing its results, has been greatly dimmed; and moral darkness has actually taken its place. The mind, led by a corrupt will, has become prone to error, and not only prone to error, but has actually passed measureably into moral chaos, from which it can only be delivered by the moving of the Divine Spirit over it in some way analogous to His moving over the natural world.

There are two conclusions which necessarily result from this state of facts. The first we may express in this form: If, in the normal state of the mind, the inspiration, which resulted from its natural relation to the Holy Ghost, was not necessarily of such a character as to give infallible accuracy to all its conceptions of truth, much less can we hope that such infallibility will attach to any results in its abnormal state. If the necessity for something higher than the mere natural inspiration growing out of the order of the mind formed by the Holy Ghost, lay in the original constitution of the mind itself, then this same necessity, now that sin has confused this order, weakened the mental and moral faculties, and rendered the whole intellectual being of man carnal and chaotic, is much greater and more absolute.

The second conclusion is, that, while the full idea of Divine Inspiration, in addition to the natural, demands also a supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit, this supernatural agency is not unnatural. The way has already been prepared for it in the original forming of the mind. The mind craves it as a completing of its primary nature and endowment—not indeed the actual principle of inspiration as a supernatural investiture in every individual case, but the legitimate effects of this principle are demanded by the original formation of each mind, to satisfy its own nature, as well as to secure the high and true end without, to which it is related. Here lies the inherent demand for a Divine Revelation. The meeting of the supernatural with the natural, the vital union of which, in the mind of man under an extraordinary form constitutes the state of inspiration, is not to be regarded as involving, in any way, a violence, either to the law of the mind itself or to that of the Spirit of God. It is only a completing, under a supernatural form, by the Holy Spirit, what had been begun by the same

Divine agency, in the natural creation. In both aspects of the subject—the natural and the supernatural—the Holy Ghost is the immediate and only source. As it was the Spirit of God who gave form and order to the mind of man and constituted, through this form and order, the source of his natural inspiration, so now, it is the same Spirit who, seizing hold of the natural, lifts it up into an extraordinary state. This two-fold view of the subject thus naturally forced upon our reflection, will enable us to see more clearly the propriety of a distinction between the Divine and Human elements in inspiration, which will meet us farther on in our subject.

At the present point, it is important to distinguish properly between Revelation and Inspiration. These two things are often confounded; and the result is confusion to both subjects. They are not related in the way of degree, as some suppose, the one being an advanced stage of the other. Their difference is specific. They are different both in their material, source and end. Revelation, as to its material aspect, is a direct divine communication both of such truth which the human mind could not attain to because of its lying beyond the boundary of the human reason, and of such as lay within this boundary, but which, on account of some cause, it has not, and would not have appropriated. Of the former kind are all those facts in the future predicted by the prophet, and all the peculiar hidden laws of Christianity; of the second kind of truth are all those historical facts which have been made to enter into the body of revelation, both in the Old and New Testaments, and to carry with them, on this account, divine authority. Revelation, in both these aspects, is truth directly communicated from a divine source. Inspiration, on the other hand, is the supernatural actuation of the Holy Ghost, by which the human mind is qualified to receive this revelation in its strict integrity, and then to communicate it, as such, either in an oral or written form, in such a way as to stamp it with absolute infallibility. Revelation may be regarded, therefore, as the divine material, of which inspiration is the proper and infallible form or expression.

Their respective sources illustrate the same difference. The Son, the second Person in the Holy Trinity, is the source of all Revelation, while the Holy Ghost, the third Person, is the source of all Inspiration. In all the revelations communicated to men during the period of the Old Dispensation, by whatever messengers or instrumentalities they may have been mediated, the Eternal Son stands forth as their source. This office attaches to Him by His peculiar nature and relation in the Trinity. He is the Logos—the Eternal Word of the Father, and as such, the Revealer of the Father's mind. "No man hath seen God at any time," &c. Besides, He stands between the Father and the Spirit, as the Divine Centre of both, receiving into His Person the hidden meaning of both, and then He comes forth, and under the form of the Word, discloses their natures. In the incarnation of the Son all revelation culminated. In this act, the source of all revelation was brought into actual contact and union with our nature itself in the only form in which it could be properly appreciated and understood. "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us." He was the light that lighteth every one that cometh into the world. He himself was the revelation; and hence He said: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

In the same emphatic way do we find the Holy Spirit set forth as the source of inspiration. "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The peculiar nature of the Spirit no less clearly indicates His office as the Inspirer. He is the Divine Breath—not the Word; and He is compared to the wind, "which bloweth where it listeth"—inflating the mind—penetrating and elevating the soul, and thus qualifying it to apprehend the revelation in and from Christ, and to give it forth in a way at once clear and unerring. And then He proceeds from the Father and the Son, that, upon the whole circle of material revealed truth, He might impress the stamp of infallible accuracy. "This agency of the Holy Spirit, by the very force of the term, forms the essence of the idea of inspiration; and the two Conceptions thus pointed out, of the Eternal Word as the Divine Person who reveals, and of the Holy

Spirit as the Divine Person who inspires, are the pillars upon which must rest any theory respecting the Bible and its origin which can deserve serious notice."

The same specific difference is seen also in the respective ends contemplated by revelation and inspiration. The end of revelation is to impart Divine substantive truth to the mind, and the end of inspiration is to give power to perceive this truth as such, and to record or declare it, as such, without any possibility of error. Such is the real difference between the two, that the one may be entirely absent while the other is actually in the mind. Thus, there is no doubt at all on the part of any, that the Patriarchs possessed an actual revelation, but the fact that none is recorded by them is evidence that they did not possess the qualification for this work arising from inspiration. Others, it is equally clear, were actually inspired men, as for instance the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, to whom no specific revelation was communicated. This, it may be supposed, was more rarely the case, as inspiration is the objective gift, and implies a public commission.

Revelation, without inspiration, is frequently communicated, but the object, in such cases, is personal, not general. So, too, spiritual illumination is also imparted, that, connecting with the revelation, and penetrating it, the individual end may be more certainly and effectually accomplished. These are both purely subjective gifts, which look, not to the setting forth of a revelation officially for others, but to personal improvement, or to the discharge properly of peculiar individual functions. In this ordinary way each Christian is no doubt frequently the recipient of gracious communications from the divine mind. Sometimes the revelations are so rich, and the rays of spiritual light so brilliant, that the subject becomes almost overwhelmed by them. Many have been led, in view of them, to fancy themselves called to the office of the Prophet; and have actually given forth utterances, under the serious impression that these were the pure words of God for the world. But the best of these need only be collected and then compared with those in the Bible, to prove their spurious character. The reason



is, that, though the revelation and the illumination are both true, and actually from Christ and the Spirit, they were designed only for individual purposes, and that the supernatural gift of inspiration proper was lacking, whereby alone the subjective revelation could be brought up and set forth in an objective and unerring form for others.

Though these two forms of Divine gift are thus specifically different in their nature, source and end, yet for the purposes of an objective revelation, they are nevertheless closely related, as form and contents. The necessity for this relation is at hand in the subjective consciousness of the individual who has been selected as the medium through whom the revelation is to receive an objective and infallible form. Without inspiration, how shall the individual know that the truth which has come into his possession, is an actual revelation from God? How shall he distinguish it from his own thoughts? and how shall he give it an infallible record? And without an actual revelation, what would be the practical utility of inspiration? In the production of the Word of God both are united.

Inspiration is purely objective. It does not look to the individual as such, but to the general. It involves a mission on behalf of others. Through it the mind becomes capable of penetrating its own subjective consciousness, of discriminating clearly between human and divine thoughts, of seizing hold upon the divine revelation, of holding it firmly in all its integrity, and, finally, of communicating it to others, or of giving it an objective form also for the world, free from all error, stamped with infallibility, and bearing in every word the authority of God.

But how does Revelation come to us?

We here meet the two elements—the Divine and Human—which enter into the subject, intimation of which has already been given. That the idea of inspiration demands the presence of these two elements, none can doubt who will reflect seriously upon its nature. That God gave a Revelation is a simple fact that meets us on all sides and constrains our faith; and that this Revelation was given through the agency of the

human mind and human words, is a fact equally clear and self-evident. Here, then, are the two elements which plainly enter into the idea now under consideration. To deny this is to deny simple facts; and to ignore the active agency of the one, by any theory that may be devised, is to ignore in the same way also the agency of the other; for as both enter into the idea itself, and aid in completing the essence of the idea, we can clearly have no proper conception either of revelation or inspiration but as we recognize the presence and activity of both elements. Take away the Divine Element, and at once every possibility of a revelation is also taken away; but admit this, and deny that human instrumentality is involved in it, and what means are left by which the Divine agency shall bring it into an objective form as a revelation *for man*?

How are these two elements related in the production of the Bible? Upon the answer we give to this question will depend our more definite view of inspiration. At this point all theories of inspiration take their rise. There are various degrees in which the one may be regarded as preponderating over the other, and each degree will give a peculiar shade to the theory. As it is not our design to enter into the minutiae of the subject, we shall confine ourselves to the two leading systems which have resulted from the undue preponderance, first of the Divine element over the human, and second, of the human element over the Divine.

The system of inspiration resulting from the first extreme, is the *Mechanical*. In this system, the preponderance of the Divine may be of such a nature, or regarded as holding to such an extent, as actually to ignore the human altogether, or, if not this, then to bind it, destroy its freedom, and render it wholly passive. Revelation, according to this view, takes its character wholly from the Divine mind. It admits of no degrees. It is stiff and unbending—has no power to accommodate itself to human capacity. It allows of no difference arising from truth which lies beyond the power of reason to apprehend, and the natural facts of history which lie open to the human mind, and which, by its own effort, it might seize and

understand. Every part of revelation moves on the same plane. It is all from the Divine mind, and from the Divine mind in the same way. The whole structure has an unvarying fixture. Even the order of the several parts, the form of the sentences and the precise words—all is directly from God, in such a way as to admit of no other agency whose free activity might in the least degree modify it.

Inspiration, according to this view, consists in the extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit exerted in such a way as to bind all the individual faculties of the person through whom the revelation is made. Human freedom is entirely suspended. Human consciousness, for the time being, is destroyed. The individual has neither thought nor volition of his own. All his personal peculiarities are deadened. His mind is wholly passive, or, if it act at all, the power that produces the action, as in the case of a machine, is from without, and not from within; and in this state, God is regarded as speaking through him, and thus projecting an objective and infallible system of revelation. When God's purpose with the individual is subserved in this way, he is permitted again, like a bent bow, to resume his natural state, all unconscious of the divine streams of truth and light which have flowed through him to the world.

That this view of the general subject is radically defective, all must readily see. The design which underlies this system of inspiration, and from which it springs, is pure and laudable; it is to secure to the revelation of God, in the most perfect way, the highest degree of infallible accuracy. Of course the revelation, under these circumstances, if this were possible, would be *Divine*. But this result demands, surely, no such extreme device. Granting that a Divine revelation might be made to the world under such conditions, we can very easily perceive that it could and would not be adapted to man. That moral product which, because of its peculiar nature, the active, conscious faculties of the mind could have no agency in forming, would be just as far removed from their power to appreciate and understand. The human element being entirely excluded, it could waken no echo in the human breast. It might, indeed, be

perfect, but the perfection would be like that of the Divine Being itself—incommunicable. Man would doubtless be amazed at it, but he could never see his own image reflected from it; he could never enter it and find there the true element of his own life; he could never incorporate it into his own being, and make it the law of his own mind. Such a revelation could admit, indeed, of none, either of the practical or theoretical purposes which a revelation, to man in the nature of the case, is designed to serve.

Every such view of inspiration is unnatural. It destroys the relation between the agency of the Spirit in the natural formation of the mind, and the same agency in the completing of this formation, by connecting it with divine knowledge. By the Spirit of God the mind of man was qualified for an active agency in divine communications; but by this theory the destruction of its activity is made the first and necessary condition on which these communications are made to it. The mind does not reach its ultimate end through a higher development of its normal state, under supernatural influences and gifts, but through a destruction of this state. It involves a radical antagonism between the natural and the supernatural, which would always prevent their real and free union. It does violence, moreover, to man's nature, by making him to be, for the time being, what he is not in fact, and according to the normal laws of his constitution. Besides, the theory furnishes no reason why anything else, as well as the human mind, should not be selected as the medium of revelation. The Holy Ghost, in this form of inspiration, is made to ignore and contradict the result of His own formative power in the natural creation. Such a deadening of our being is manifestly not an inspiring of it. Inspiration is the inbreathing of life, by which the natural faculties are more highly elevated and made more intensively active—not the inbreathing of death, by which they are depressed or destroyed.

The peculiar manner of God's operations in other respects proves the erroneous character of this mechanical view of inspiration. God everywhere works through the instrumentality

of man. In choosing men for the accomplishment of any given purpose, He does not proceed arbitrarily, but has, as it will be found on examination, minute regard to the natural fitness of the men for the end to be attained. This natural fitness is a ground of the choice. Instances of this fact might be given without end, but we cannot tarry with detail: and after the men are thus selected, God uses the natural faculties of which they are possessed, and in this way accomplishes His spiritual purposes. But the theory of inspiration which makes it necessary for God, in order to project a revelation, first to destroy or set aside the natural faculties which He has created, breaks with this whole analogy of Divine operations; and induces, moreover, an actual contradiction into these operations. A system that finds itself compelled to do this, can, clearly, have no just claim to the merit of securing to revelation the highest degree of consistency, adaptation and infallible accuracy; for, if it necessitates a contradiction in the operations of God, through which a revelation is projected, what reason can it give its friends that God will not also contradict Himself in that revelation itself?

But how can we believe any such mechanical system of Inspiration to be true, when in the Bible itself we see such marked individual peculiarities? No one can intelligently read ten sentences in any part of it without discovering all the idiosyncracies of their respective authors. This is true in the Old as well as the New Testament. The inspired penmen wrote according to their peculiar nature. Pass carefully through all the books and you will not find any two written in the same style. The peculiar normal and cultivated tendency of each writer is clearly expressed. The human element, under its normally free form, is patent in every page. How can we account for facts like these on the ground of a system that denies to the respective authors of the Bible all individual action and freedom? View this theory from what ever quarter you may choose, and such will be the number of difficulties which will crowd upon your vision, that you cannot, even if you strongly desired, believe it to be true.



The other system is called the *Dynamical* system. Here the human element may be made unduly to preponderate over the Divine. The theories arising from this source are numerous, each marked by the degree of preponderance on the part of the human over the Divine element, the moral worth of revelation diminishing as the human factor in its production unduly increases. In some the human is so prominent that the Divine is entirely ignored, and men left wholly to the unaided activity of their own minds in the production of the Bible. This was the view taken by the infidel Strauss, and others, who maintained that the Scriptures are a collection only of pre-historical myths. Socinians stand very much upon the same ground. They allow indeed that the sacred writers were honest men, and competent witnesses of what they saw and heard, but still fallible, and, like other men, prone to error. Some confine the attribute of infallibility to Christ, and regard the apostles as highly competent though fallible reporters. Others admit the Divine into closer union with the human mind in the origin of the Bible, whose views are still far short of the truth. The Quakers regard the inspiration of the authors of the Scriptures as consisting only in a preëminent degree of that spiritual illumination, which, in a less degree, is common to all Christians. In this sense the whole conception of inspiration is subjective, and wholly so. Others, who hold still less prominently the human element, admit that inspiration renders the sacred penmen infallible in all truth that is specifically of a spiritual or religious and supernatural character, but that in regard to all historical facts, natural phenomena, and scientific laws and deductions, which have been incorporated in the Bible, they, as well as others, are liable to error. This leaves a large portion of Bible fact uninspired. Sad work is often made, on this principle, of the five books of Moses especially. In the system of Schleiermacher, who is substantially represented by Mr. Morrell, the equitable blending of the two elements is still more nearly reached. Inspiration is still regarded, however, as a thing of altogether minor importance, as compared with the general and vivid representations of the devotion and

sacrifice of Christ, and of the intense religious life of his immediate followers which the New Testament gives. For them it consists, as already stated, in a general elevation by the Holy Spirit, of the intuitional powers, which finds its analogy in the genius of the unaided mind. Thus error, in regard to this subject, increases just as these two elements are removed from each other, or just as the one is regarded as preponderating unduly over the other. Both these systems are false, and both, in some sense, are true. The error lies in the improper relation of the two leading elements,—the truth in their proper union or relation. What is the true relation?

We may not be able fully to penetrate this union, or to understand minutely the inward and mutual operation of the two factors in the production of the sacred Scriptures; but from the nature of each, connected with the general result, we need not be ignorant of at least some of the more general and necessary conditions. That the union involves activity on both sides is clear from the nature of the case; and that this activity is in perfect keeping with the laws peculiar both to the Spirit of God and the minds of the sacred writers, so that no violence is done to either, must also be so manifest as to constrain the belief of all. The supernatural, though it really enter the natural, neither destroys nor enslaves it. In the elevation of the human mind, and its union with the Spirit of God, in inspiration, there is more implied than the mere excitation of intuition. An extraordinary and new spirit-principle is given to it, which, however, instead of paralyzing its ordinary powers, only brings them into more intense activity. The mental action of the sacred writers was not suspended, but rather "sustained and made fertile by the Divine Spirit, with a view to the preparation of the Scriptures, in a two-fold manner. Either, all that lay beyond the limits of human experience and human knowledge was imprinted by the Spirit in their minds, in prophetic contemplation, or, in those cases in which events lay within the bounds of human knowledge, their natural ability to distinguish error and truth, was in so far exalted and sanctified, that they were enabled to ascertain and comprehend the truth in its

purest form."—Kurtz's *Sacred History*, p. 28. In this extraordinary state of the mind, it is made not only to open itself freely to the revelation which is made to it, and to receive it, and in some true sense to reproduce and make it its own, but also to give it forth in human words precisely expressive of every shade essential to its complete integrity as in itself considered. We do not say that the words in which the mind, in this state, embodies its divine thought, are mechanically dictated by the Spirit, but that the ordinary relation which holds between a clear, full thought and its appropriate word or words (which relation was fixed by the Holy Spirit in the Natural Creation, and which, for ordinary purposes makes the outward word to be a true and commensurate exponent of the inward thought or feeling), is raised into this extraordinary state, and so connected both with the subject-matter of the revelation and the terms adapted to its expression that it can neither be mistaken in regard to the one or the other, and that it will, by the force of this new divine principle, freely and necessarily, give an infallible form to the thought it embodies. Yet the words will take their character at the same time freely from the peculiarities of the individual who is made the bearer of the divine message, just as the message itself is made primarily to correspond with the same peculiarities. They would not be the precise words which another in the same state, but with different idiosyncrasies, would select, and for the reason that the revelation itself would not be precisely the same that another would have. But, though the words of each be different, those used by one are just as infallibly expressive of the sense of the message communicated to him, as those of another are of the message given to him. The message itself will depend upon the natural peculiarity of the individual, and the words will depend upon the peculiarity of the message. Hence the diversity. It can easily be perceived, indeed, that this diversity in the way of expression on the part of different sacred writers, is one of the strongest evidences that each is infallibly true. Allowing the free activity of individual peculiarities, and the fact that God, when He called different per-

sons to be the bearers of His revelation, had regard to their respective peculiarities, and gave to each the message adapted to these, it would be quite evident, that if they all used the same words, they would not and could not express fully the peculiar truth assigned to each. But if each speaks his own language under the Spirit of God, corresponding with his own peculiar nature, however different his words may be from those of another in regard to the same general subject, the effect can only be the enlargement of the general circle of revelation, bearing in its own nature convincing evidence of infallible accuracy.

This is the origin of the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testaments. Though all their parts may not be revelations in the same high sense—for many portions are composed of natural facts and principles which the minds of the sacred writers might, and oftentimes doubtless did know of themselves—still, as they have been recorded under the inspiration of the Spirit, they are, equally with other portions, the Word of God. It is inspiration that gives them their value in the Bible. These natural facts, thus located by the Holy Ghost, do not speak from earth, but from heaven. They have a new, higher and holier mission; and connecting with the natural incidents of Christ's miracles and parables, they point to Him to whom it is the design of all revelation and inspiration alike, to lead the soul. Thus, upon every part of the Bible—upon every subject, upon every style of composition—aye, and upon every word, God has impressed the seal of Divine infallibility.

## ART. III.—THE MINISTER A PUBLIC MAN.

BY REV. S. N. CALLENDER, A. M., GREENCASTLE, PA.

History is the gradual revelation of the divine will, with reference to humanity, in the form of life. It is the unfolding of the original idea of creation through the thoughts and feelings and actions of men. It takes in the whole domain of our human life, from the beginning to the end of time; and gathers together, in one plan and purpose, all of experience and activity which heretofore has, or ever will be, realized by our race. Its living idea is the grand controlling force and moulding power which energizes the onward movement of the whole world, ever fashioning its destiny, and shaping the means to their appointed end. It recognizes in man a self-determining agency, and through his intelligence and will works out its ultimate purpose. In this moral agency, this power to consent to, or resist the force of the divine idea, do we find the cause of those abnormal vicissitudes, and unlawful demonstrations, which confront us upon the arena of history. Had not sin entered into the world, these bitter results would have had no existence. Then would the stream of history have been unruffled. The human will, being in full harmony and accord with the divine, it would have moved peacefully onward, realizing to man, at every stage of progress, the full force of his controlling idea and destiny, and filling him with the blessedness for which he was created. But sin having entered into the world, it has arrayed him in an attitude of antagonism to the divine plan, impelling him, continually, to escape from its embrace, and to disrupt the whole order of creation. This rebellion hurled him against the thick bosses of God's all-concluding and pervading idea, and placed him in a hostile attitude against his fellow man. Hence the conflict and



strife, the misery and bloodshed which mark his track, on the page of history.

But, with all his self-will and opposition, he is left without the power to escape from the force of that purpose and plan, which conditions all his outward relations, and permeates his very being. He may, indeed, array himself against it, but only in some way to subserve its advancement, while he, in turn, falls crushed beneath the wheels of its resistless progress. All men stand in the bosom of this divine idea, carrying in itself the force of life. And he can be man, in the proper sense of the term, and realize the purpose of his creation, only as he allows himself to be controlled by its power, and directed by its guidance.

We are not, then, to regard the human family as a great multitude of units, the interests and destiny of each one of which are rounded off and concluded within the confines of his own individuality. But rather as one grand organic whole; permeated by a common life, comprehended in the same creative plan, and appointed to the same mission, namely: to minister to the consummation of that plan.

To him who has ears to hear, do the undertones of consciousness reveal this fact. Indeed, we can scarcely conceive of a man so deeply besotted in sin as to be altogether insensible to it. There still will be voices sounding from the depths of even a wrecked nature, that will tell of lost harmonies; that will speak of relations and purposes and designs which are not comprehended in his individual person; and life has been a failure to him, because he sought to save it upon the treacherous shoals of selfishness, while he might so surely have saved it by committing himself to the purpose of that God,

"Who plants his footsteps in the sea,  
And rides upon the storm."

We all feel that we are included in an economy more comprehensive than ourselves. That there are wants stirring within us that tell of outward relations which we may not ignore. Life is more than meat and drink. The sense of kindred and rela-

tionship lies far deeper than any considerations of mere self. It indeed underlies its true idea. All right feeling must recognize the family to be a vital constitution, in the bosom of which the individual finds his proper meaning and happiness. It involves interests which attach themselves to the very centre of his consciousness, and, reaching out beyond his individual person, conclude him in relations which condition all his activities. We feel that we have personal individual wants and interests, but these are subordinate to the more general and equally vital concerns of the family. The former are included in the latter, and are dependent upon them for their rightful satisfaction. This is true of each member of the family. Hence it is that these common interests gather themselves together in the Father, as the head and governing power of the organism. Each member fills out the measure of his individual activity, but still in strict subordination to the head as the conservator of the general interest, in which all equally stand.

The same principle holds good with reference to the more comprehensive constitution of the State. In a certain sense, the citizen feels himself to be an individual interest. He distinguishes between self and the multitude of fellow citizens around him. In this capacity does he exercise himself in his avocation, and his immediate incentive is the well-being of self and of the family. And it is not unfrequently the case that, in the pursuit of his private interests, he seems to regard self as the final motive, and for a time forgets the relation he sustains to society and the general well-being. But there is, notwithstanding, a consciousness of relations, which reaches out beyond himself, and comprehends the whole order of society in which he stands. Life for him is made up in great measure of the movements of society. He feels himself to be so linked to his fellow men, that his sympathies and feelings are ever going out towards them. An event which affects his neighbor, touches the springs of thought and feeling in him. And if that event affects the community at large, he instantly recognizes his relation to the general body, and feels that the event in its effects reaches his individual person. In the affairs of govern-

ment, he feels that he has a vital interest. And however narrow or sordid may be his selfishness, he may not divest himself of the consciousness that he is comprehended in it as the power of a general life, and that its fortunes, whether for weal or woe, are his own. Hence the controlling power it exerts over him, and his ready response to its claims, even to the most painful sacrifice of self, and even, if needs be, of life itself. He feels that it is an interest deeper, stronger, and more important than his individual life, and surrenders himself accordingly to it.

Now the citizen may fail to discern the *significance* and *design* of this general interest, as the power of history and the force of the divine will, shaping and controlling the destinies of men. He may fail to do so, as he contemplates it in the fullest light of intelligence possible to the natural mind, as embodied in the highest forms of government, or as the savage, as he sees it in his rude, tribal form; yet in either case, will he ever have the consciousness of standing in the bosom of a constitution, which, while it equally comprehends all his fellows, conditions and shapes all his private relations, makes him what he is, and beckons on his hopes for the future. All feel, accordingly, that these general public affairs are of the very first importance, and call for the most jealous care and deference. And those to whose special oversight and management these interests are committed, are looked upon as conservators and guardians of the public weal.

Thus we see that, starting with the consciousness of the individual, we are conducted to the necessity of a class in the State, who may be denominated public men. And this, too, even though we should regard the state as a mere human institution, and its powers as but the concession of the individual from prudential considerations. In *this* view of the case even, public men or officers of government stand clothed with an importance which challenges and commands the respect and homage of the private citizen. But, when we consider the State as a divine institution, and its powers and aims as being comprehended in God's purpose and plan, and the workings of the machinery of government as the development of this plan, we can understand

why it is that these public interests reach so far down into the consciousness of the individual, and command so effectually his obedience and self-surrender; why it is, that he sees in the public man a power to which he does homage, and looks up to him as his guide and protector.

But the State comprehends not the whole range of history, and the full idea of the divine plan. It stands in the sphere of the natural, and, while it may subserve the temporal interests and growth of the individual, it has no power to meet the wants of his spiritual nature, and satisfy that deeper consciousness which is the main-spring and primary force of his being. Aside from this deeper religious nature of man, the State would be powerless to minister truly to even his temporal well-being; for its ability to influence him in the way of motive, would reach no deeper than self-interest. He would obey its behests, and surrender himself to its control only from prudential considerations; and to what extent these have power to withstand the overwhelming flood of sin, and the powers of darkness, we all are but too well informed by personal experience and the broader page of history. Humanity as a whole, as well as every department of its life, would fall the helpless victims of these disintegrating forces, and all would be thrown into anarchy and confusion before them, but for the religious element which the fall did not totally destroy, and which makes the redemption of man possible. The State needs the principle of authority as answered to by a sense of moral obligation, which is vastly more powerful than worldly prudence or self-interest. This principle holds in a consciousness of higher, deeper, and more comprehensive relations than pertain to our natural estate. It is that voice in man that tells of spiritual and eternal relations—of relations that gather in and conclude all nations and all races, all times and all ages—of relations that transcend all the limits of time and space, that, reaching back to their origin in the creative mind of God, stretch anxiously yet hopefully forward to the grand consummation of the divine plan in the heavenly world. It is this consciousness in the individual, that clothes the state with authority, and enables it to work out its

mission. But still its mission is but partial, and it can never meet and fully satisfy this consciousness. Man feels that he has wants and interest that reach far beyond. These hold in the all-comprehensive organic idea or purpose of the divine mind.

The revelation of this purpose we have in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here we have the gathering together of all things, both which are in heaven and which are in earth, in one. Here do we find the solution of the whole mystery of creation, the answer to the ever-protesting consciousness of humanity, and the satisfaction of its every want. Here is it brought into its right relations to the whole order of creation and to the being of God, as the centre and ground of its life. In this fact, then, does humanity behold its last and ultimate good, and only now, as the individual comes to be taken up and comprehended in this fact, can he attain the true idea of his being, and find rest for his consciousness.

This great fact holds now for the world, in the Church, the Body of Christ, as the force of a general life. Christ is head over *all things* unto the Church. Herein is comprehended the last meaning and purpose of the whole order of the world's history for all time. And it is possible for man, and all institutions; for all departments and legitimate movements whatsoever, of our human life, to realize their purpose and design, only as they come to be comprehended in, and permeated by the life of the Church. The State, therefore, is not an ultimate end in itself. It is but a means to an end beyond itself. Its officers and public men are entitled to all proper respect and reverence, as ministers in one of the departments of the outworkings of the great plan in which it is comprehended. But they can be true to their position, and entitled to their full measure of respect, only as they take knowledge of the more comprehensive interest in which the nation is included, and bring all their resources to bear for its promotion.

It remains, therefore, for the Minister; the ambassador of Christ, the officer in that supernatural constitution, in which is revealed God's ultimate purpose, to stand forth as the conserva-



tor of the highest interests and dearest relations of the children of men. How important soever others may be, however necessary to their individual prosperity and social well-being, all are doomed to final failure and disappointment, only as they are conditioned and controlled by them. All earthly joys and hopes, all peace, all rest, after which the soul ever longs and strives, must end at last in the blackness of eternal despair, only as they are raised above the ruin of death, under the power of which by nature they lie, and, included in that order of grace which stands superior to death, are enlivened by the light of eternal life.

Man's religious nature, ever uttering its protest against the wrong of sin, ever revealing itself in some form or other, even in the darkest night of ignorance and barbarism, attests his conscious sense of a relationship to God, as his highest, greatest, all-concluding good. Hence the priest, the officer of his religion has ever stood related to him in the holiest interests of his being, and to his offices has he looked as the last means by which he was to be delivered from misery, and raised to happiness and bliss.

To the minister, therefore, by way of eminence, pertains the dignity of a public benefactor. To his charge is committed in this world the governance and management of God's plan, and His historical dealings with men. He is God's representative, and mediates between him and his creatures. He is clothed with a spiritual power, which reaches the inner sanctuary of the human spirit, and enters like leaven into the life of every institution. It is through his ministrations that all history is quickened with its true life, enabled to move onward to the realization of happiness and bliss for man, and empowered to overcome the opposite ruinous tendency introduced into the world by sin.

As has already sufficiently appeared, all other historical forces combined, would be powerless to raise man above the sphere of the natural. They can make no provision for his spiritual nature. And in the midst of any amount of temporal prosperity, must leave his consciousness to languish and suffer, for the want

of that element, which is the highest and distinguishing attribute of his nature, and in which precisely centers his capability for rest in the ultimate perfection of his being. To this all past history bears its ample testimony. The most cursory glance over its dark pages before Christ, and those of nations shut out from the power of his religion since his advent, is sufficient to make it abundantly evident that all its forces were insufficient to raise man out of his ruined estate of sin; and so far from their ability to heal his wounded consciousness, their best efforts could only serve to deepen and intensify the keenness of his sense of want, as a preparation for the revelation of Christianity, as the only power which could restore his nature. Since the time of its revelation, the whole stream of history has been enlightened by its power. It entered into it as its controlling, vivifying element. And notwithstanding the many attempts which have been made to account for the phenomenon of modern history, as the result of merely natural causes, it stands attested this day by the *consciousness* of every Christian man, which lies back of all his reasoning, that it is the legitimate outworkings of Christianity as its vital leaven.

This being the case, very little reflection is needed to see, in what relation the ministry, into whose hands this interest is committed, must stand to society, and to history in general. While other agencies are ever active in carrying forward its forces; while art would remand rebellious nature back again to its lawful subordination to man; while science would unlock the hidden mysteries of knowledge; while government would gather together her children, and seek to enlighten, protect and defend them; yet can these agencies be effectual for a truly beneficial end, only as all are taken up and comprehended in that great revelation of the divine will, as comprehended in the institutions of our holy religion. The artisan is necessary to meet the daily wants of society, the teacher to enlighten and expand the intellect, the civil officer to order the movements and direct the steps of the citizen; but it remains for the minister to mediate that power which comprehends and penetrates all these, revealing their significance and conducting them onward to that higher destiny that lies beyond the confines of this world.

That the Ambassador of Christ is entitled to, and necessarily must occupy this first and controlling position with reference to society, has ever been felt and acknowledged. The powers of darkness have ever sought to depose him from this position, simply for the purpose, that sundering the order of nature from that of grace, the world might be cut loose from its spiritual moorings, and left to drift into the vortex of anarchy, ignorance and destruction. The scholar has sought to make reason the measure of truth, and to teach man that his highest good lay in obedience to its deductions. The politician has discovered in an ideal state this same interest, and decreed a divorce between matters civil and religious. But against all this does the human spirit file its persistent protest, and has hearkened to the voice of the Gospel as the key-note of the harmonies of its being.

Herein do we discern the reason why the ministers of religion have to so large an extent been made to stand so near to the central point of power in all the departments of our human life. The sciences, notwithstanding their repeated efforts to break their allegiance to religion, and to array themselves against its claims, have ever yet been brought back by their agency, and made repentantly to confess to their office as handmaidens. Fast by the throne of imperial power, in Christian lands, has there ever stood the Christian minister; and even though at times his voice may have been disregarded, yet has the ruler been powerless to resist its force or ignore its effect upon his spirit and conduct. He (the minister) it is who gives shape and tone to our institutions of learning, and through them down to the private walks of life, does Christianity govern the development of mind. In all the public movements of the day, having reference to the weal of society, and the amelioration of the condition of our race, the minister, by common consent, is called to the foremost ranks, and allowed in large measure to control and shape the organization. In the affairs of communities and towns and villages, he is looked upon as a public man, and felt to stand at the head of the general and most precious interests of the people. In every interest involving education, moral reform and common beneficence, he is expected to take a

leading part. To him society looks up for counsel in the formation of its opinions and the determination of its questions of policy. And all this, too, not so much because of his superiority in intelligence, or the greater correctness of his judgment, as because of the conscious sense of his relation to it, in the deeper and more solemn interests of its spiritual wants. He is invested with a power and dignity even in the eyes of wicked men, and by his simple presence he restrains their wayward actions. What consistent minister has not noticed that vice draws back from his approach; the voice of profanity is hushed when he appears; demonstrations of wickedness are, as a general thing, suspended as he passes by; and indulgence in passion and appetite shrink from his observation as from a forbidding and unfriendly power. Even the children learn to know him in his official and public character, and by their modest reserve and polite salutation acknowledge and profess their conscious appreciation of his sacred office.

Moreover, in his position as counsellor and advisor in the midst of his people and community, is his character as the representative of a higher and general interest more fully acknowledged. When business entanglements confound the judgment; when social differences refuse to be adjusted by the ordinary rules of wisdom and prudence; when sorrow, like a strong man, breaks through the sacred defences of home, and bereavement unnerves the energies, and spreads the pall of darkness over the bright prospects of hope; or when the wounded spirit writhes under a keen sense of its derelictions, how turns the heart to that heavenly power, which alone can bring order out of the wildest confusion, and afford a solace for every ill! Then does the soul pant for an enlightening wisdom, and a sympathizing heart, which it feels this world possesses not, other than in him who stands the representative of *that One*, whose sympathies were schooled in the experience of every human sorrow, and whose power to deliver is illustrated by his conquest over death and the grave.

Of the eminence of his position among the children of men, and the moulding power of his influence, should every minister

make solemn earnest. He may not regard his office as a mere cloak or badge of authority, but rather the power of a living principle lodged in his person. As such, he is true to it only as he surrenders himself to its control, and allows it to shape his life and utter itself in his conduct. He can be a teacher of the truth, and a faithful steward of the spiritual forces which govern the world, only as his walk and conversation illustrate them. His office must govern him, and be allowed to assert its dignity and authority in his every-day relations to his fellow-men. Thus alone will he commend himself to the favorable consideration of his people, and assure their consciousness, which constrains their outgoings towards him. That civil officer—that Judge can but illy subserve the claims of justice and good order in the community, whose life is a mockery of his office, and whose conduct fails to give expression to its dignity. There must be in the minister a conscious apprehension of his office as divine; then will he command the respect to which he is entitled, and be effective for good in his labors. Indiscretions, therefore, and undignified conduct on his part, not to mention vices and crimes, will be like dead flies in the apothecary's ointment. For the people are justly jealous of the conduct of their public men. Condescension to small and vulgar acts and expressions, improper associations, undue subserviency to temporal interests, and especially indulgences and amusements of questionable propriety, will inevitably prove damaging to his efficiency, cripple his efforts for good, and inflict a corresponding injury upon the cause of Christ. How sadly does not that minister's labor result in detriment, rather than in good to the community, who allows himself to play the buffoon, to swagger with coarse familiarity or presumptuous affectation of importance, to make unseemly displays of a horse-jockey propensity; or, on the other extreme, to swell with pride and vanity, and play the gloved and laced ecclesiastical dandy? How can such an one fill his place as an agent, in the outworkings of God's solemn purpose in the creation and redemption of the world? How, be a moulder and shaper of the onward progress of history, and be a guide of souls to the Lamb of God.



If the view we have taken of the grave and commanding relation which this sacred office holds to the history of the world be correct, we may with profit, in the way of conclusion, turn our thoughts to a contemplation of the solemnity and importance of the future which seems to lie before us as a nation. We not unfrequently hear loud and pompous pretensions proclaimed by our more ardent and boastful politicians, as to the importance and controlling power of our country. And while as American citizens we are prone to sympathize in their enthusiasm to a greater or less extent, still, do we not often feel inclined, in common with the jealousy of other nations, to attribute this to the blustering spirit of "Young America," and credit largely to our national vanity? Yet are we confronted with too much of reality and fact, to allow ourselves to dispose of the whole matter in this humiliating way. The position which the United States have come within the last half century, and especially within the last few years to occupy with reference to the other nations of the world, the influence they exert in moulding and casting their progress, may well give the color of reality to the assumption, that on them as a nation, devolves the burden and honor of leadership, in at least the more immediate advance of the world's progress.

It is not necessary at this time, to call to mind any considerable number of the manifold indications, which would go to justify this conviction. We stop to notice a very few of these, and that with the greatest brevity. Our most prominent characteristic, that of unexampled energy and progress, is rightly to be estimated, only as we place it in contrast with the stagnation which has come to characterize most of the older nations. We discern in their movements and visages, the effects and marks of age, while the warm, bounding pulsations of youth inspire our every undertaking. We seem to be actuated by a consciousness which tells of a mission of mighty import, demanding extraordinary resources and a wide-spread domain for its fulfilment. We feel that the vastness of our work requires an emancipation from the constraints which hem in the activities of other nations. The resources and territorial limits,

which were ample for their day and mission, are totally inadequate to the requirements laid upon our shoulders. It is doubtless the stirring of this very consciousness within us, that begets our characteristic hurry and impetuosity. What was once a year for the world, must be compressed into the limits of a month. The extraordinary must be brought down to the level of the ordinary, and what was once the endowment of the great and mighty, must come to be the heritage of man in the ordinary walks of life. How have the mighty works and valorous achievements of other nations, been robbed of their lustre and brightness, by the almost miraculous demonstrations of our energy and ingenuity! As it were in a day, have we so far outstripped our compeers in the march of history, as to place us unquestionably in the lead, and to divest us of those restraints which their jealousy and their power had sought to impose upon us.

And now, may we ask, is all this a mere freak of fortune—a happy chance which has fallen to our lot in the game of history? Is it a mere spasmodic and frenzied demonstration in the life of humanity? If so, then is there “method in its madness.” Shall we take to ourselves the glory of all this, and profanely say that our own arm hath wrought it? Or shall we reverently recognize the hand of that God, who raises up one nation and casts another down, all for his own glory, and the accomplishment of his righteous purposes?

Again, we may notice our almost limitless expanse of territory, and that too, shut out from the encroachments and jostlings of other nations. This fact too, we are bound to regard as providential, and as bespeaking the vastness of the task charged to our accomplishment. But more especially should we discern a significance, in the stupendous natural resources which are committed to our hands. We were accustomed to hear, not many years ago, of the wonderful mineral wealth of some of our States. But what are these compared with the results of recent discoveries. Resources, ten-thousand fold greater than our fathers ever dreamed of. Let us but try to imagine the value of a mine of wealth, a thousand by fifteen

hundred miles in extent, and that too, as yet, but here and there made to pour forth its hidden treasures, and the mind is confounded. And now when we reflect, who it was that created this immensity of resource, and who bestowed it where it lies; when we remember that God made nothing in vain, and in wisdom appointed their uses, who dares to say that God did not appoint this provision, for the execution of the very work which He has committed to our hands?

True, all these things pertain to the sphere of the natural. But still are they comprehended as means in the plan of creation, and are appointed to subserve its revelation and completion.

All this now may serve to suggest to our minds, the part Providence designs this nation to take in the future history of the world. And as we have already seen the place the minister occupies in shaping its unfolding, we are prepared to form some estimate of the solemn responsibility which must rest upon him.

Truth and error, the powers of darkness and the Church, are this day in conflict for the mastery, as to which shall control and govern the momentous issues which are bound up in the destinies of our beloved land. The fearful extent to which error, whether in the form of infidelity or of false theology, has come to occupy the mind and heart of this nation, may well cause anxious thought, as to the issue of the conflict. We rejoice, however, in the faith, that our history must and will be true to God's purpose in the end. But this presupposes the faithfulness of those who stand His messengers, and who officially wield the power that governs the world. If ever there was a period that called loudly for a vindication of truth as over against error—that demanded the assertion of a sound Christological theology, as opposed to all false and defective systems, that period is the one in which we live. It unquestionably then is the duty of the minister to give special heed to this precise interest as of paramount importance. Not that the fearfully solemn matter of the salvation of the soul of the individual is to be accounted as calling for less earnest and la-

borious effort, but that the assertion of true faith, as the vitalizing force and truth of history, should more than ever command his indefatigable labor.

---

ART. IV.—THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.\*

---

We distinguish between the *dogma* of the Atonement and a *theory* of the Atonement. The dogma is revealed for faith, and as such is to be received on the authority of the revelation. That Christ offered Himself as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world, and that forgiveness of sins is preached on the ground of that expiation, is a fact of divine revelation which continues in every age to be received by faith. But the human mind seeks to penetrate the articles of faith, and construct a theory in regard to them, which shall show their relation in a general system. These theories may fail at certain points to give full satisfaction without necessarily vitiating the dogma itself; and yet it is also true that they sustain a very intimate connection with it. A false theory persistently maintained, if on a vital point, does vitiate in the end the article of faith itself.

It is becoming more and more evident that the theories of the Atonement which have seemed to satisfy the mind of the Church since the Reformation, are being brought under new examination. There is a manifest desire to reach a theory which will better satisfy all the conditions of the great problem. Hence, we have repeated efforts to present the subject in a new and clearer light, as in the recent works of Young and Bushnell; and on the other hand, we have earnest efforts to guard against new

---

\* The Atonement. By the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D.D., Professor of Didactic, Historical and Polemical Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa.

The Vicarious Sacrifice, Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation. By Horace Bushnell.

"The Light and Light of Men." An Essay by John Young, LL.D. (Edin.)

error, as in the case of Dr. Hodge's recent work. The subject has received new attention also in the Theological Quarterlies, both in this country and in Europe. We propose in the present article, not so much an attempt to criticise what we regard as inadequate and false views of the Atonement, but rather to apply to its treatment certain principles of theology familiar to the readers of this Review. We believe that they possess peculiar advantages in the treatment of this, as well as other dogmas, and where properly applied will throw new light upon many subjects which otherwise present insuperable difficulties in their scientific statement. Whether we shall be able successfully to apply them to the subject in hand, or not, we must ask beforehand that the truth of the principles themselves must not be judged by any want of success in this respect.

In order to obtain an adequate view of the Atonement, in its restricted sense, it is necessary that we should view it, not as an isolated work, but in its relations and connections with the whole work of Christ in which it stands. It is very evident that Christ did more for man than merely make an expiation for his sin. He did more than merely remove the calamity of the fall by taking away the curse of sin. This is clear. His work does not leave humanity where sin found it, but in addition to its deliverance from the curse, He raises it up to a glorified, undying state in the heavenly world. He carries it through its probation, through death, and places it where it attains what we may suppose to be the true destiny for which it was originally created. In receiving the benefits of the Atonement, the believer receives far more; for in addition to the pardon of sin he comes into a relation to God more intimate than that in which Adam stood before the fall. And this, too, by virtue of the introduction of a new life principle which creation, or humanity, did not possess originally. The Incarnation comes before us as a *new creation*, fully commensurate with the first creation, and designed to carry up to its completion and consummation that first creation in a new order of life. It is the coming in of the supernatural as the necessary complement and fulfillment of the merely natural.



What is usually understood as the Atonement, viz., the making satisfaction for sin by the death of Christ, is only a part of this one great and glorious work. That work consists primarily in the union of the divine and the human natures in Christ, and in the glorification of humanity in the heavenly sphere in the person of Christ. As a consequence of this, and the end to which it looked from the beginning, the way is now opened to bring men into participation with this heavenly glory in their eternal redemption.

It is reasonable to suppose that the end thus attained was in the divine mind originally. We cannot suppose that it is a mere afterthought of God, as though He had in view another and different destiny for man, and that his destiny, as now reached through the incarnation and death of Christ, is something which was not included in the divine purpose in his creation. Equally abhorrent would it be to suppose that while this was the end God had in view for man originally, yet it could not be realized except through the fall, and that therefore, though it was a free act, yet sin was a necessity in the eternal purpose of God. No view that makes sin a necessity, whether that of supralapsarianism or that of certain German philosophers, can be maintained. But now, if there was for man a glorious destiny originally, above the state and condition in which he was created, and if the destiny which he attains in Christ must be regarded as substantially the realization of that original destiny, then it follows that sin appears in our world only as an obstacle in the way to be removed, a parenthesis in the grand onward flow of the kingdom of God. As such it cannot be regarded as a fundamental principle in its relation to Christ's work, but rather as a hindrance which now conditions the manner or form of that work. In other words, the problem involved in the incarnation is the union of the divine and human, the Creator and the creature, the natural and the supernatural, in order to bind man and the whole creation in harmonious union with God in the heavenly sphere. We must, therefore, inquire how the presence of sin conditions the work of Christ in necessitating an Atonement.

It may be objected to this view that in the Scripture the coming of Christ into the world is continually referred to the Atonement as its end. From the first promise, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," down through the whole development of that promise, everything is made to point to the death of Christ as the end of His coming, and therefore it is going beyond the record to find another end for which He became incarnate.

Our answer to this is that the Scripture regards man as he is historically, and directs itself to that which is of *immediate* importance, that which relates to his immediate necessities. Sin now is his immediate misery, and deliverance from it is his immediate necessity. Therefore it refers to this first. So, for instance, the original deliverance referred directly to Egypt, and the promised reward to Canaan, and yet we know that these were only types of a still greater deliverance and a still greater reward. But in addition to this, there are passages of Scripture which do bring out a work of greater scope than merely the Atonement; passages which refer to Christ as sustaining an original and eternal relation to man, and to His work as comprehending far more than merely man's deliverance from sin. He is the first-born of every creature, the last Adam, who comes, not merely to deliver man from sin and death, but to gather all things in one, whether things in heaven or things in earth. Indeed, so fully was the early Church imbued with this thought, as brought out in the wonderful and all-glorious fact of the Incarnation, that they were occupied with it more than with the death of Christ. The great problems of the Incarnation and the death of Christ wrought more powerfully in the first ages than the problem of the Atonement, in the restricted sense. This is, indeed, often regarded as an evidence of obtuseness and error; but it is far more sensible, we think, to find in it just the truth that explains it, that the problem of the person of Christ involves far more than merely an Atonement for sin.

We start, then, with the position that it was God's original design in creating man, and that it is the ultimate scope of the

Incarnation, to unite man in a free and glorious union with God. The creation went out from God by His own free act through the Logos; it returns to God through the God-man. Or, as this thought is beautifully expressed by *Martensen*:\* "In the general revelation of Logos, the Son of God is pre-supposed by every creature as being the One *through* whom all things are created, and in whom all things shall be summed up and gathered together as their head. In his revelation as Logos, the Son proceeded from the Father as God (*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*); in His revelation in Christ on the contrary, He returns back to the Father as God-man. This return is richer than His outgoing, for He comes back with an entire kingdom of children of God, ('Behold, I and the children thou hast given me,' Heb. ii. 13)." Or in the expressive words of Irenæus, which stand as the motto of this REVIEW: "Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans"—one Jesus Christ our Lord, who came into the universal order of created things, to re-head all things in Himself. And this is only the Pauline idea, based on Eph. i. 10.

This work of re-heading the race, and through it the whole creation, in Christ, is involved in the Incarnation. This is the *punctum saliens* of the whole mission of Christ as the mediator between God and man. Here humanity was first brought into personal union with divinity. We say *humanity*, for however much Dr. Hodge may argue against the reality of that generality which we call humanity, any other position necessarily involves error in regard to the person of Christ itself. It must be conceded by all who hold the orthodox view on this subject, that the Son of God in His conception and birth did not join Himself to an *individual* of our race, either in germ or at any stage of development. If, then, the individual life only is real, and the race life, or human nature, as general, is only a thought or conception of the mind,—an abstraction,—then we are driven to the conclusion that the Logos really joined Himself to an

---

\* *Martensen's Dogmatics.*

abstraction. This is brought out by what St. John says: "The Word became *flesh*," not man, a man, but flesh; by which evidently we are to understand human nature as a generality, distinguished from its individual form. On this point, however, we may have more to present presently.

The first question, now, that meets us is, What was the condition of that humanity which Christ assumed, and how did it come into that condition? That humanity was fallen when Christ came, all will acknowledge. It follows, then, that the humanity which Christ assumed was fallen; for He took it, not as it was in Adam before the fall, but as it was historically in the Virgin Mary, whom as Protestants we must regard as involved in the universal fall. The nature which Christ assumed was in a position of rebellion against God, and under His wrath, and the law of death. How did it come to be in this condition? Dr. Hodge answers by the juridical theory. Adam was the federal head of the race, the *legal* representative of all his descendants, by the covenant of works. When he fell, God imputed his guilt to all the members of the race, so that they are guilty, not first because they are descended by natural generation from Adam, but because of this legal imputation. How they become sinful is a different question with Dr. Hodge. This fact may derive some explanation from the organic character of the race, though even here he ridicules the idea that such a fact as sin can be perpetuated by natural generation.

We answer the question, how did human nature come into this state of sin and death? first, by the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise; secondly, that this fallen nature is perpetuated in all their descendants. Adam is the generic head of the race; when he fell human nature fell in him, and now all its members are involved in one common sin and guilt. We care not to go at length into the discussion of realism and nominalism, of creationism and traducianism, here, although in some of its aspects the point is vital as regards the theory of the Atonement we intend to present. Dr. Hodge tries to show that even Augustine could not

have been a realist, because he was not a traducianist. According to his logic no one can be a realist who is not a traducianist. His logic here, however, is too strong for the facts. Augustine, though he wavered as to the metaphysical question between creationism and traducianism, *was*, to all intents and purposes, a realist of the most pronounced character, and his writings abundantly show this, and are quoted by Dr. Shedd, who is himself, as Dr. Hodge acknowledges, an avowed realist, to prove it.\* Did our space allow, we might give quotations to almost any extent. That Anselm held to the same view must be evident to any one who will examine his words.

But Dr. Hodge says: "The doctrine of the Reformed Churches could not have been Realistic, because Calvin and the Reformed theologians, almost to a man, were Creationists." Here again is an evident effort to force out facts by logic. "Calvin could not have been a Realist because he was a Creationist." But suppose his words prove that he was a Realist, what then? Simply that he was not as logical as Dr. Hodge. But we have nothing to do with Calvin's logic when we are considering the facts in the case. It would be just as difficult, perhaps, for Dr. Hodge to make Calvin's views on the sacraments agree logically with his view of the decrees, and yet Calvin held to both. Instead of showing weakness of intellect it is often an evidence of true greatness of mind to hold what are sometimes called antinomies. At any rate we have no right to make our logic the test of what others, as great and good as we, have believed and taught. Any one who desires to read what Calvin did hold on this subject, need go no farther than his Institutes, p. 227: "When we hold, according to the Scriptures, that *sin was communicated* from the first man to all his posterity, Pelagius urges that it was communicated by imitation, *not by propagation*. Therefore good men, and beyond all others Augustine, have labored to demonstrate that we are not corrupted by any adventitious means, but that we derive an innate depravity from our very birth . . . . Thus it is certain that Adam was not only the progenitor, but as it were the *root*

\* See quotations from Augustine in Hist. Ch. Doctrine, by Dr. Shedd, p. 77.



of mankind, and therefore that all the race were necessarily vitiated in his corruption." Calvin then goes on to say that this must be held, *notwithstanding* the dispute between Creationism and Traducianism, as though he felt the difficulty as regards logic to which Dr. Hodge refers, but did not allow it to stand in the way of a theory which comes with such overwhelming force both from Scripture and reason.

But there are minds quite as acute and logical in our own day who hold fully to the reality of humanity, or human nature, as a generality, and explain the imputation of sin by it, over against a mere judicial imputation *ad extra*, who yet are not decided as to the question between Creationism and Traducianism, but who combine the two, as Ebrard, and also Martensen, though the latter inclines more to Traducianism. Are they then not Realists, because Dr. Hodge could not be a Realist, and not be a Traducianist? The facts are too much for his argument.

It may be difficult indeed to explain the presence of guilt in this view. All we can say is that its explanation lies in the organic relation of individual will to will as it acted freely in Adam. But this difficulty is not at all removed by the juridical theory. That theory makes the individual to be guilty because of a judgment of God precedent to his sinful state. This is just as unreasonable as any theory of guilt can be. God's judgments are not fictitious. He pronounces each individual of the human family guilty *because* he is a partaker in the sin of the fall, in other words, because he is involved in sin by reason of his organic relation to fallen humanity. We will only add here, in regard to this whole subject of imputation, that we do not mean that the sin of Adam, in eating the forbidden fruit, is carried down as an act now past, to each individual, and that he becomes responsible for it in that sense. Imputation internally would become just as mechanical in this form as in the outward imputation. A sinful act, in its connection with our nature, is a living fact, which is never past as to its real power and life, until it is overcome. The man who steals to-day is equally a thief to-morrow, if the sin be not

purged away. Adam's sin, as an act of rebellion against God, *lives on* in the race, and as thus present we are guilty of it. But with God it is one thing throughout, from beginning to end.

Without pursuing this point further now, we proceed with our statement.

Christ having assumed human nature is to make atonement *in* human nature as well as *for* it. The problem comes before us primarily in this form: What is required in order that fallen humanity in His person may be lifted up out of its fallen condition, and glorified in the heavenly sphere? We answer first, it must be rendered sinless. We say *rendered* sinless, because the sinlessness of Jesus signifies something more than mere passive or negative innocence. It lies in the very nature of the holy conception of Jesus by the Holy Ghost, that sin was eliminated at that beginning point of His life, so that there already the victory over sin commenced. It is not to be inferred, however, that His subsequent life was not henceforth occupied with the problem of sin as related to His person. Because He assumed fallen human nature, and by virtue of His relation to that nature as the second Adam, He came into direct personal conflict with the powers of sin, and by a free exercise of His will turned it from Him and overcame it. Hence the temptation of Christ, as we contemplate it first in the wilderness, was not a sham. The conflict was real. And the victory was not a fate and necessity, nor an overpowering exertion of His divinity, but it was a free act, in which the human will of Christ performed its functions without in any way having violence done to its freedom.

Thus throughout all the stages of development of the human nature in His person, by His free obedience He not only preserved that humanity free from all stain of sin, but He made it victorious against all the assaults of sin. In this conflict and victory we have presented to us what is called the active obedience of Christ, as forming an element in the Atonement which He made for the world. The significance of His life in this respect for our common humanity, is similar to that of the act

of our first parents in the garden of Eden. It was a second trial or test for the redemption of the world, just as the first was a trial as humanity stood in the original creation. Hence the sinlessness of Jesus, His active obedience, is vital for our redemption, not merely as preparing Him for the sinless offering which He was to make, nor as so much merit to be set over to our account; but primarily as involving the successful solution of the problem of gaining the victory over sin, as this problem was involved in His own person in its relation to humanity. It is commonly said that the terms of the covenant required that the sacrifice when offered must be a spotless one, that one who is himself a sinner could not make satisfaction for the sins of others; but we must not therefore conclude that the only significance of the awful conflict with sin in which Christ engaged, and the glorious victory which he gained, find their only significance as preparatory to His death. Rather, we repeat, are we to find its primary meaning in that conquest over the combined powers of sin, which constituted humanity in Him a victor in the trial, a trial on which a second time hung the question of man's destiny.

The significance of Christ's work entirely must be found first in its relation to His own person. This is the point of departure for the different theories of the Atonement. The Juridical theory of Dr. Hodge, no less than the Moral Influence theory of Bushnell, or the Governmental theory of the New England theology, finds this significance in what it is for men directly, whereas in our view redemption in the fullest sense is wrought out primarily in the person of Christ, in order that from thence the fruits of His mission and work may be made over to all who believe on His name.

Do we mean then that Christ redeems Himself first? Was He in need of redemption? Was He not born sinless, and could victory over sin have any advantage for Him? This requires us to consider now, as throwing light also upon our first point, in what sense Christ became a substitute for sinful man, or in what sense our sins were laid upon Him, as the Scriptures declare.

Dr. Bushnell answers this question by asserting that our sins were laid upon Him in the way of sympathy for us in our misery. He labors to show that His tender sympathy for the afflicted, and His labor of love in healing them, fulfills the meaning of the prophecy, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." He says: "For He took them not literally upon Him, but only assumed them to bear in a way of pains-taking labor, and exhaustive sympathy, and disgusting attention, coupled with much abuse and little gratitude." Here the work of redeeming is an outward one, much as a physician goes into a hospital to take upon him the work of healing the sick there. It does not help the matter that in the case of Christ the sympathy and the power are deep and full, because they are divine as well as human. According to this view the conflict with sin and suffering is not a conflict within His own person, having its significance first for His person, or rather humanity in His person, but for bodies and souls around Him.

Dr. Hodge maintains that our sins and sufferings were laid upon Him by an outward imputation, so that His sufferings were of a penal character in that sense. It answers the case, however, no better than the other. It does not account at all properly for the Incarnation. If we ask why the Son of God became incarnate in order to become our substitute, it would most probably be answered that the same being that sinned must make satisfaction for sin, for in the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, God would not punish another for the sins that man has committed. Therefore Christ could not have assumed angelic nature, and suffered for us in that form. This is true when the necessity for assuming human nature is properly understood. But we maintain that the Juridical or satisfaction theory does not explain this necessity. Christ, according to that theory, is, to all intents and purposes, *other* than the one who sinned. The very conception of imputation which it sets forth implies this; for God accepts a substitute, and requires that the penalty of sin shall fall upon him as a foreign burden. It is hard to see, indeed, why Christ, according to this theory, could not have come in the nature of an angel, or why He

could not have created a finite nature to be joined with His divinity, since the case required only that He should suffer a certain penalty in order to make satisfaction for man's sin, but not necessarily that He should suffer it in human nature.

In opposition to this, and every other theory which makes the imputation of our sin and misery to Christ to be of this outward character, we maintain that Christ took upon Him our sin and misery in the fact of His assuming our nature as fallen, and as Himself the second Adam. Free from all sin Himself, and victorious over it at every point in His life, yet by reason of His relation to the race as the second Adam, its absolute head, the burden of sinful humanity rested upon Him in a deeper sense than that of mere outward imputation.

In considering this point, it is well to bear in mind the problem which Christ had before Him, viz.: not merely to make atonement for sin, but to unite human nature with the divine, and raise it up to a glorified state, in order that the individuals of the human family by receiving life from this new fountain of life might be raised up with Him to glory and immortality. Now what He did and what He suffered were a part of this work. His sufferings and death were on the way He was to move, in carrying our humanity into the heavenly sphere, and that, too, by virtue of the relation He sustained to the race through His incarnation.

We must view Him now as taking upon Him, in virtue of the very constitution of His person, our sins, as involving the suffering of the consequences of the violated law of God, and this, too, as including the determination of God against sin in the form of wrath. He took upon Him our sin as involving not only *suffering*, but also *guilt*.

Christ experienced the consequences of violated law, though He Himself had broken no law, but only honored the divine law at every point by perfect obedience. He stood in the centre of the world's fallen life, Himself holy, and against Him rushed the currents of a discordant humanity. He was keenly sensitive to every throb of suffering man. Not by way of sympathy merely, but in sympathy *because* of the organic unity



of life between Him and the world, He experienced the burden of human suffering and woe. We may find analogies to this mystery, even though we cannot fully explain it. If the hand is wounded the whole body, even though the centre of life remains sound, experiences the pain. The functions of the body go forward regularly, but they find an obstruction in that member, which reacts and produces pain until the obstruction is overcome by the victory of healthy life over the wound. A family has fallen into disgrace. It has incurred the penalty of a violated law, so that in its character as an organism it is made to suffer. Its head is innocent, personally, yet as its head and therefore its representative, the parent comes under the ban. He suffers with and for the family. By separating himself from his family he could escape the consequences, but he chooses to remain there for his family's sake. A tribe or nation has fallen into disgrace, involved itself in suffering. A good man assumes the position of its head and ruler. If any one now should be singled out for punishment, the blow would certainly fall upon him. He bears it and the nation is freed from the ban. These are only analogies, and do not, by any means, cover the mystery of Christ's relation to the race. That relation is of the deepest and most intimate character. He is not only a member of the race, but the centre of it. He is the true and absolute head of the race. Accordingly He is called the *root* as well as the offspring of Jesse. When He came into the world He came unto *His own*. And now standing thus at the very heart of humanity, every current of human sorrow and misery carries its burden to His soul and He suffers for man.

But sin not only brings suffering as a consequence of violated law, but as a free moral act it must refer the suffering continually to a determination of God against it in the form of wrath. The divine wrath may be called, indeed, impeded love, but this must not be understood as though God remained unaffected by sin. We need not say, indeed, with Delitzsch,\* that "wrath and love are not merely the several modes of God's feeling;

\* *System of Biblical Psychology*, p. 172.

but two principles, distinct as fire and light, of the everlasting glorious revelation of His nature;" or that, just in those words: "The Son of love betook Himself down into the depths of the Godhead's wrath, clothed the humanity, which had forfeited the divine likeness, with His own absolute divine likeness, took the wrath upon Himself, and annihilated it in Himself,—and thus brought back the creature that had fallen from love, again to the principle into which it had been created;" yet however we may define the wrath of God, we must regard it as a real determination of God against sin, which has its counterpart in the fear and terror of the sinner.

The subjective theory of the Atonement teaches that all this is a mistake. There is no such determination in God, but that sin only affects the subject sinning, and that all that is necessary is to overcome this feeling of distrust and fear on the part of man, in order that the divine love may again be recognized as flowing into him. If our consciousness of the divine wrath against us by reason of sin is only a fiction, we could have no evidence that our consciousness of His love is aught else, and we would be left in skepticism and doubt in regard to all the determinations of God's being.

There was wrath in the cup which our Saviour drank to the dregs, although there was in Him the triumph of faith by which He clung to the divine love. This is sometimes said to involve a mere play or drama. Christ knew He was the object of the Father's love, and the Father was in Him and with Him in the propitiatory offering; how, then, could He really come under the divine wrath? It may, indeed, be difficult to explain what seems thus to be a double consciousness, but it is only the same difficulty that lies in the doctrine of the *Kenosis* all through the life of Christ,—not more difficult than to explain how He *could increase in favor with God*, when in one view He was eternally in absolute favor.

But the Juridical theory just as really fails to state the case fully at this point, when it teaches that the fact of Christ's bearing our humanity was not the cause of His enduring the wrath of God, but the fact merely that as an innocent person

He was suffering for others. He did suffer under the wrath of God for others, but those others were now, as to the deepest centre of their life, in Him. It is humanity in Him which, in the terrors and sufferings of Gethsemane and the cross, is passing through the necessary conditions by which alone it could rise from its state of condemnation and death, to the favor of God, to life and immortality.

Violence is always done to this awful mystery when at this point we array two parties acting as by covenant or contract—when God the Father exacts the penalty, and the Son comes to comply with the demand. The fulness of the Godhead is in the Son, as well as in the Father, and the Atonement was one act of God, and it is God, in the Person of the Son, who carries our nature up through the determinations in the divine nature against fallen humanity, as necessary to man's salvation. Thus we would seek to explain Christ's consciousness of the wrath of God against sin, by the presence in Him of that humanity, which, though sinless in Him personally, was organically linked with the life of the race out of Him, burdened with the sin of man. In *this* sense as our representative, that is by virtue of His thus having humanity joined in His divine-human person (and not as our representative legally merely, as by an outward arrangement), He suffered the wrath of God against the sin of the world. Here we have one side of the Atonement satisfied; but this is only one side.

We must now take up again what is the active central principle, after all, in both His active and passive obedience, or His obedience and suffering, viz.: the fountain of undying life in His person, by which the final victory is to be gained over death and hell, and a new sphere of blessed immortality gained for our humanity. If we are to find in the constitution of His person that which makes the Atonement sufficient, on the side of suffering, we must find also in that person the source of another equally necessary side of the Atonement, viz.: the positive deliverance of humanity from the power of death, and its exaltation to the heavenly, glorified state.

This deliverance is sometimes looked upon in a way which

makes it to stand in no necessary inward connection with the constitution of His person, or the struggle passed through in His death and resurrection. The Atonement is regarded as closed by His death, and the resurrection as an act of divine power involving new and different activities. But His resurrection was involved in the problem of His life from the beginning. His life was moving historically towards this goal. That which was in the sphere of the earthly was to pass into the sphere of the heavenly as its legitimate end; and that, too, in such sense as gathering up in His life at this point all the merits of His death. That death was anything but an isolated fact, a mere suffering of a certain penalty, by which in this separate view the anger of God was to be appeased, and by looking at which in faith the sinner was to receive justification. Anything, we say, but that. In that view it would, at best, have been only negative in its results. The justice of God is satisfied, the penalty is borne, the law honored, but what now of the interests of that humanity which Christ had assumed? All those interests, we may say, hang upon the issue of His conquering death and rising from the dead. Not only that He may come forth to reveal the fact of His propitiatory death as a testimony for faith, but as rising now into the sphere of that higher world, in which all the fruits of His life, His death, His victory over death, are gathered up in His glorified life.

Thus the Scriptures regard His resurrection. Thus He Himself first speaks of it. "*Ought* not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?" Is this not the end to which all the prophecies point, the issue that is necessarily involved in His person and work? The value of His death is made by the Apostles to rest in the glorious fact of His resurrection. If Christ be not raised then is your faith vain, ye are yet in your sins. They preached Christ and the resurrection, preached the resurrection as carrying with it and in it, our justification, our deliverance from sin, and our birth to a new life.

It is ominous that a work like that of Dr. Hodge, in which he evidently intends to go over the whole ground of the Atonement

ment, makes no reference to the resurrection of Christ. This fact is not to be explained by saying that he intended merely to treat of His death; for he does refer to His life of obedience, and what he regards as its meaning and relation to our Saviour's death. If what went before is discussed, that which immediately follows might be considered as well. Not even in the discussion of the application of the Atonement does the subject of Christ's resurgent life receive any notice whatever. We say this is ominous. It shows clearly that in Dr. Hodge's theory of the Atonement the resurrection of Christ has no place. Whatever its meaning may be in redemption, it does not belong here. Dr. Bushnell, though his view looks constantly and only to the subjective side of the Atonement, and though he seeks to find in Christ the real power and life which in us effects our reconciliation with God, yet seems to find no place for the resurrection of Christ, as an epoch, a transition in His life and work, in which precisely human nature rises to its true immortality, and becomes a fountain of heavenly grace for man.

Yet here, in our view, the interest culminates. Here only we come to that fuller and better conception of the Atonement, as an *At-one-ment*. Here it is that we can now leave the narrower, technical meaning of the word, which limits it to merely making satisfaction for sin, (a meaning right and proper in its place), and take in a wider scope, the bringing of the human really into harmonious undying union (*at-one-ment*) with the divine in the heavenly world. Thus the Atonement was wrought out in our nature, it is objectively complete, and the way is now open for its application, by the advent of the Holy Spirit.

When the Atonement is regarded merely in the light of a certain penalty paid to satisfy the claims of justice, and as bringing about a reconciliation between God and man, it is not possible to understand properly the mission of the Holy Ghost, or the nature of the Church as related to Christ. Hence, according to the Juridical theory of Dr. Hodge, the application of the Atonement is a new and separate transaction upon which God enters, now that satisfaction for sin has been made. A

free pardon has been purchased, which God now grants to those who are included in the divine decree. This pardon would be of no avail if it were not followed by a work of grace in the human soul. Hence, in making over the pardon, God regenerates and sanctifies the elect by a new and separate work of the Spirit. The Atonement only removed the obstacle which prevented God from revealing His goodness to man. Christ becomes thus only the instrumental cause of applied redemption, instead of being its fountal source. This appears from the following words which Dr. Hodge employs in reference to this point: "*We believe that God could have changed man's subjective moral condition by the direct action of His Holy Spirit upon the human soul, without the objective exhibition of His love by means of such a sacrifice as that made in the person of His Son.*" If this means anything at all it means that there is no necessary subjective connection between the Atonement of Christ and the work of grace performed in the human soul through the Holy Ghost. And it is difficult, in this view, to see why the Holy Spirit did not come with the fulness of grace in the Old Testament dispensation, before Christ was crucified, and arose, and was glorified, as well as afterwards on the day of Pentecost. If His decree took in all who believed on Christ previous to His incarnation, why could they not enjoy complete redemption before as well as after the incarnation? We have no doubt Dr. Hodge would reply they did enjoy the same grace notwithstanding the assertion in Hebrews: "These all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

Evidently, however, the Scriptures present this subject in a very different light. The glorification of Christ was necessary in order that redemption might go out from Him to men. "The Holy Ghost was not yet, because Christ was not yet glorified." The Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, is now the sphere in which the glorified theanthropic life of Christ becomes the principle of new life for His people. A new dispensation is thus opened, the dispensation of the Spirit, which gives birth to the



new order of grace, the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church. In this dispensation Christ is the source of life for those who are united to Him by the Holy Ghost. Everywhere in the New Testament He is thus spoken of. He Himself says: "I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you." "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." And the Apostles speak of Him as now living in them, the hope of glory. "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." They represent His death and resurrection as living facts. St. Paul says: "I am crucified with Christ." "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." Everywhere Christ, now risen from the dead, is referred to as the fountain of life in the new order of grace; and it is precisely in the form of life that the merit and virtue of His death are made over to them that believe. His life is more than His death, or rather His life is that in which His death becomes available for us.

If now we ask whether Christ died for all men, our theory leads us to the plain answer, He died for humanity as a whole. There can be no room for a limited Atonement in the Calvinistic sense. The Atonement in its objective character is commensurate with humanity, because it was human nature which Christ assumed. Nothing is more mechanical and abhorrent, because nothing is more contrary to the Scriptures, than that Christ atoned only for the sins of a portion of the human race. It destroys the generic character of redemption, and thus destroys the parallel drawn by the Apostle between the first and second Adam. Just as really as the first Adam included in him the life of the race, Christ, the second Adam, includes in Him also that same life, now redeemed. So the Heidelberg Catechism evidently views the case. After stating, Ques. 16, that it was our *nature* in which Christ made satisfaction for sin, as though the conclusion would follow that therefore all who are included in that nature would necessarily be saved, it proceeds to ask: "Are all men then saved by Christ as they have perished by Adam?" The answer is: "No; only such as by true faith are ingrafted into Him, and receive all His benefits."

Here is the only limitation of the Atonement. We are inserted into the fallen Adamic life by natural generation; we are inserted into redeemed humanity, the order of grace in Christ, by regeneration. Dr. Hodge makes use of what we must regard as a puerile argument to prove that God did not design the Atonement for the whole race, when he urges this: "Christ died after generations of men had been going to perdition during four thousand years. With regard to that half of the race who perished before His advent, it is hard to see the bearings of a general redemption. And if it had no bearing upon their case, it is hard to see in what sense the redemption is general." It is *not* hard to see the bearing of a general redemption to that portion of the race, if Dr. Hodge will but consider that the promise of redemption was first made to Adam, and was available in its provisions for Cain as well as for Abel, and that it was Cain's own act of unbelief which deprived him of its benefits; that the same promise was made to Noah and all his, and that it was Ham's own act of wickedness that separated him from the blessing. God did not produce heathenism, but man made the separation in the direction of sin, while God made the separation in the direction of the good. Of a like character is his argument drawn from the heathen world since Christ. How can the Atonement be for the whole world since a large portion of the human race have no knowledge of it? Is then God responsible for this? Is it because He does not take in the heathen in the provisions of redemption? How then could we be concerned to carry that knowledge to them? The very commission to preach the gospel to all the world is based upon the fact that an Atonement has been made for the whole world. "Who will have all men to be saved." Yet not all are saved, because all will not come to the knowledge of the truth.

It is not our object to discuss at all the subject of predestination. There is a proper sense in which with the Reformed Church generally we hold it for truth; but we feel assured that its truth does not require that the Atonement in its objective character should be regarded as partial and not general.

The Juridical theory of the Atonement held and advocated by Dr. Hodge, and the Moral Influence theory of Dr. Bushnell, as well as what is called the Governmental theory, and the view presented by Dr. Young, all fail, as we conceive, by making the Atonement something *ad extra* instead of making it an Atonement *in* humanity. There is more of an effort in Bushnell and Young to find in it a power working *in* man, than in the work of Dr. Hodge; but they find it after all only a moral power, a life if you please, but not a life which comes into organic union with men in the order of grace. The error underlying all these theories, as we believe, is in regard to the *essential nature* of Christianity. None of them find it to be really a new *life* for the race. They make it to be in some way at last a scheme for saving men instead of the salvation itself, and thus Christ Himself becomes a means to an end beyond His person, and not Himself the source of life for all who believe on His name.

But here we are met by the singular argument of Dr. Hodge in regard to justification. His argument is drawn from Rom. v. 18: "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; *EVEN* so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Now if we are condemned because we are in Adam by a life-union, then we are also justified because of our life-union with Christ. But this latter, Dr. Hodge says, is not true, therefore the former is untrue. But this latter, we affirm, is true. The sinner *is* justified because he is included in the redemption in Christ. In order to appropriate this redemption he must be engrafted into Christ, or be born again of the water and the Spirit. But this appropriation can be his personally only on condition of faith. Therefore we are said to be justified by faith. The fundamental fact, on the ground of which God pronounces the sinner just, is his sharing in the righteousness of Christ. When the woman touched the Saviour and was healed, Christ said to her: "Thy faith hath made thee whole." This was the condition on her part, and so far as activity on her part was concerned it was this which made her whole. Yet it is plain from the narrative that the efficient cause of her heal-

ing was the virtue which went out from Christ. We are justified by faith in Christ, but not as though, on this condition, the righteousness of Christ is merely reckoned to our account, without, at the same time, our inheriting that righteousness. That view of justification which sunders the declaration of pardon from the inheritance of the righteousness of Christ, sunders what God has joined together. "Therefore there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," &c. Only in Christ are we justified.

The argument of Dr. Hodge, that if Christ redeemed humanity generically, then He must be in union with the entire genus, including the lost, which, he says, is horrible to think of, to our mind is equally a *non sequitur*, and seems to us to betray gross ignorance of the plainest principles of organic life. If a branch is sundered from a tree and decays, does it then follow that the life of the tree is still united with the decaying branch? And is the organism divided or destroyed thereby? If a man loses an arm, does it follow that he still maintains a union with the lost member? If God should annihilate certain individuals of the human race, does it follow that humanity would be incomplete in its organic character? No more does it follow that the humanity redeemed in Christ is affected by the fact that many of the individuals of the race fall away into perdition.

Our limits will not allow us to refer particularly to the theories of the Atonement presented in the works of Bushnell and Young, named at the head of this article. As a protest, earnest and sincere, against the satisfaction theory set forth by Hodge, they must certainly find sympathy in all earnest enquirers after the truth. This latter theory resolves the solemn work of the Atonement, as Dr. Young remarks, very much into a court-house and criminal trial, and we turn from it as unsatisfactory and abhorrent. But relief from this is not to be found on the other side in any merely subjective theory of the Atonement. What we need is to bring these two sides, the objective and the subjective, to a reconciliation. This reconciliation, we believe, is to be found in what may be denominated the *Generic-Head*.

ship Theory, which we have endeavored briefly and imperfectly to state.

We will only add here yet, that all the positions which we have taken in this article are equally true, whether we hold that Christ would have become incarnate if man had not sinned or not. We have purposely stated the essential, fundamental, necessity of man to be, union with God through the Son of God.

We believe, indeed, that Christ would have become incarnate if man had not sinned. We receive the words of *Martensen* on this point as stating the truth: "If, then, the Redeemer of the world stands in an eternal relation to the Father and humanity,—if His person has not merely an historical, not merely a religious and ethical, but also a metaphysical significance,—sin alone cannot have been the ground of His revelation; for there was no metaphysical necessity for sin entering the world, and Christ could not be our Redeemer, if it had not been eternally involved in His idea that He should be our Mediator. Are we to suppose that that which is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? That there would have been no place in the human race for the glory of the Only-Begotten One but for sin? If we start with the thought of humanity as destined to bear the image of God; with the thought of a kingdom of individuals filled with God; must we not necessarily ask, even if for the moment we suppose sin to have no existence: Where in this kingdom is the perfect God-man?" &c.\*

But all that has been said is equally true, whether Christ would have become incarnate, had not man sinned, or not. That we must consider the subject of the Atonement, in the restricted sense, in its relation to, and as included in, the whole work which Christ performed for the world, that the satisfaction which Christ made for our sins, He made, not only for humanity, but in humanity, that the virtue and merit of the

---

\* *Martensen's Dogmatics*, p. 260.

Atonement are contained in His undying life, as the conqueror of death and hell, and that this life is the fountain not only of pardon for sin, but also of life and immortality for us, through the Holy Ghost,—all this is not at all affected by whatever view we may take in reference to that question. Yet we believe the view of that question we have presented—held by Lange, Martensen, and other theologians of acknowledged reputation,—serves to exalt our conception of that greatest of all facts in the revelation of God and the history of the world, THE INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD.

---

ART. V.—RECENT SANITARY OPERATIONS IN EUROPE.

BY LEWIS H. STEINER.

*Sanitary Institutions during the Austro-Prussian-Italian conflict, by Thomas W. Evans, M. D. Paris, 1868.*

*Un Souvenir de Solferino par J. Henry Dunant, Geneva, 1863.*

Until the coming of the blest day, described by Isaiah, when "there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and His rest shall be glorious," and when God shall make "wars to cease unto the end of the earth," the rattle of musketry and the reverberation of cannon will break upon the ears of mankind as so many startling proofs, that brotherly love is not the reigning spirit among the nations of the earth. And until such love shall bud, blossom and bear abundant fruit, difficulties will arise, from injuries actually done or abstract principles violated, which will only be brought to settlement by force of arms. Peace conventions may be held like that of Geneva, but their members will desert their deliberations and, following Garibaldi's course, will be



found fighting for the cause they have espoused, if it should seem in peril. Indeed there can be no human panacea or antidote invented to do away with war. The people of the earth must be enlisted under the blood-stained banner of the cross for the purpose of fighting against the hosts of the arch-fiend, before they can be made to look upon the shedding of fraternal blood as something essentially repugnant to the human soul. But war may be divested of a portion of its most brutal terrors, and the soldier need not forget that his opponents as well as his fellow-combatants are entitled, when stricken down and helpless either from wounds or disease, to such kind offices as the good Samaritan extended to the man who had fallen among thieves on his journey from Jerusalem to Jericho.

It is proposed in this article to show some of the indications of philanthropic activity, which the late European war has developed, being to a certain extent an imitation of the sanitary operations carried on in our country during the Rebellion. Although this activity as a whole cannot be looked upon as a *direct* result of that brotherly love which our religion so warmly inculcates, still it must indirectly be attributed to such influence, since we are taught that every good gift, and every perfect gift is from above. Like the mild, diffused gleamings of light that usher in the dawn, such wonderful activity could never have existed had there not been a glorious sun whose rays, penetrating the thickness of darkness, bore infallible testimony to their source. In this, as in all the philanthropic promptings of the human heart, that which commands our respect and admiration is illumined by light derived from Christianity. Where the latter flourishes in purity we have philanthropy in its highest form of charity—ἀγάπη; when mankind shall range itself in the ranks of the followers of Christ, then this charity will produce more perfect works than can result from mere philanthropy. Until that day we must hail the deeds of the latter, as in some sense, prophetic shadowings forth of better times.

The main, indeed we might say the only object of the soldier, is to achieve victory in the quickest manner possible and with the most thorough overthrow of his opponent. Hence his suc-

cess is attended with suffering and anguish; his successful march is destruction to life; his victory is accompanied with the cries of the wounded and dying. During our late war, the sympathies of the national party were thoroughly aroused, because almost every family had contributed some of its nearest and dearest to swell the armies engaged in the contest. Desiring to bring the comforts of home to the dear ones in the field, money was freely expended, in the purchase of articles that were not incompatible with a soldier's life, and which would sooth his pillow of anguish and remind him of home sympathies. Hence arose Relief Societies, which, by consolidation into the Sanitary and Christian Commissions, acted in the field and in the hospital as the almoners of the people's gifts. It is pleasant to place it upon record, that these Commissions knew no restrictions in the exercise of their philanthropic functions, and that friend or foe, if suffering within reach of their store houses, were supplied with all relief possible. The historiographers of these commissions have endeavored to give condensed histories of their labors, but have failed to give more than an *idea* of what was done and how it was done. Still the people and the world have learned to look upon these labors as honorable to the American name. For the first time, in the history of war, succor had been brought to its sufferers by a whole nation, and an attempt on a large scale had been made to diminish the terrific anguish which is inevitably attendant upon its course.

All good deeds bear perennial fruit in the way of influencing like deeds, wherever man has learned of their existence. The good done by the Sanitary Commission, during our war, did not cease with its close, but has borne such fruits in the German war, as make us hope that all nations hereafter will count it a duty to imitate under similar circumstances. We must not claim that succor to the sick or wounded, in time of war, is an original idea with us. Religious orders have labored in this direction for centuries and have gained the admiration of the world for their self-denial. Pious men have thought it a most blessed privilege to sacrifice all comforts of home and family

for the purpose of entering upon such work: and philanthropists have been found on every battle-field, in civilized countries, whose efforts were directed to bringing succor to the wounded. During the German war the energy of Florence Nightingale secured good nursing to the soldier and freed him from many of the baneful effects of official misconduct; and the Grand Duchess Helena Paulowna, established a system of field and hospital succor, which brought more than two hundred trained woman-nurses to the hospitals at Sebastopol and Simpheropol, assigned them places in the ambulances, and in the field where the wounded were collected during the battle. "The letter of instruction" under which these women entered this service of relief opened as follows: "In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, in perfect charity and self devotion, zealously to assist the medical authorities in the care of the sick and wounded, and also to strengthen the patients under their sufferings by Christian consolation."

The attention of Europe was, however, first directed towards the necessity for some *general* action on the subject of battle-field relief, through voluntary aid properly systematized and controlled, by M. Henry Dunant a citizen of Geneva, whose experience after the battle of Solferino, which was fought June 24, 1859, has been so interestingly narrated in his *Souvenir de Solferino*. The battle resulted in killing or wounding, 3 field marshals, 9 generals 1566 commissioned officers and about 40,000 enlisted men and non-commissioned officers; and to this number may be added more than 40,000 men attacked by diseases incident to the climate or resulting from the exposure antecedent to or during the battle, making over 80,000 men broken down or killed. Mr. D. was so affected by the horrible sufferings of the wounded that he organized all the voluntary nurses, he could secure from the villages around the battle-field, and devoted himself to the grand work of relieving distress, selecting as a principal centre of his operations one of the churches of Castiglione, called Chiesa Maggiore. It would be of especial interest to quote largely from his account, but space will not admit. We can only say that the efforts of

Dunant and those who worked with him saved hundreds of lives, and led him to discuss the feasibility of establishing relief societies in time of peace, which should always be ready to render assistance to the sick and wounded in time of war, and might be made of great good during epidemics and other occasions of suffering and distress. He considered that it would not be chimerical to count upon a sufficient number of generous, sympathetic souls as ready for the formation of such societies and willing to encounter whatever danger might attend the performance of their self-imposed duties. The pages of history presented some prominent examples:—the Archbishop of Milan, Charles Borromeo, had shown a brilliant example during the pestilence of 1576; John Howard had passed his life in trying to relieve unnecessary suffering in prisons and hospitals; and others had labored in the same good cause. Why could not this nineteenth century bring forth in a larger and more efficient form, similar examples of self-denial?

Dunant's efforts were furthered by the *Société d'Utilité publique* of Geneva, which at length issued circulars to the different governments of Europe inviting them to send delegates to a conference to be held at Geneva on the 26th of October 1863, "to consider the means of providing for the insufficiency of the Sanitary service of armies in the field." This conference was presided over by the veteran General Dufour of Switzerland. It discussed the practicability of employing voluntary aid for the succor of the wounded in battles, and that of declaring the wounded and all employed in attending to their wants as not subject to capture but entitled, under all circumstances, to military protection.

After many discussions, in some of which doubt was entertained whether a sanitary organization, based upon the voluntary efforts of the people were possible, the following recommendations were made:

1. Let the governments grant their highest protection to the committees of relief which shall be formed, and facilitate, as much as possible, the fulfilment of their mission.
2. Let *neutrality* be proclaimed in time of war, by belligerent

nations, for the ambulances and the hospitals, and let it be equally admitted in the most complete manner, for the personnel of the Sanitary staff, for the voluntary nurses, for the country people who may go to assist the wounded, and for the wounded themselves.

3. Let a uniform, distinctive badge be recognized for the Sanitary corps of all armies, or at least for the persons of the same army who are attached to that service; let a uniform flag be also adopted for ambulances and hospitals in all countries.

Another convention was proposed, at which duly authenticated representatives of the European governments should discuss the recommendations of the Genevan meeting of 1863. In the meantime\* "the influence of the Sanitary Commission had extended beyond the borders of the United States. Public attention was aroused in Europe. In the German-Danish conflict Relief organizations, regularly organized on the precise model of those existing in America, rendered the greatest service. Her majesty the Queen of Prussia added the greatest lustre to her crown by the affectionate gratitude she merited from the wounded by visiting the hospitals of Schleswig and Holstein, and by the declaration she made when distributing relief to the victims of the two hostile armies: In this crisis, I do not speak or feel as a queen, but express my sympathy for suffering humanity as a woman."

On the eighth of August, 1864, the International Congress was held at Geneva, and a treaty was concluded the main features of which were ratified and approved by the principal governments of Europe. In brief, these were as follows: that ambulances should be recognized as neutral, and be protected and respected as such by the belligerents as long as they contained sick or wounded, but that their neutrality should cease if they were guarded by an armed force; that the *personnel* of hospitals and ambulances, comprising all persons engaged in their superintendence and government, in the care or transport of the wounded, as well as voluntary nurses (*aumoniers*)

\* *La Commission Sanitaire*, par Evans, XIII.

should participate in the benefits of the neutrality so long as there might remain any wounded needing attention; that such persons might continue in the exercise of their functions even after capture or rejoin the armies to which they belonged, and when their work was done that they should be protected until they would reach the outposts of their armies; that the *material* of the hospitals left behind should be subject to the laws of war, and that the persons engaged therein should only have power to take away their private property, but that the *material* of the ambulances should be free from capture; that the inhabitants of the country, as well as volunteer hospital attendants or nurses, who should aid the wounded, should be respected and protected, and that every wounded soldier received and cared for in a house should serve as a safeguard to the same; that the sick or wounded soldier should be received and nursed regardless of his nationality; that a distinctive and uniform flag should be adopted for hospitals, ambulances, and convoys, which should always be accompanied by the national flag of the nation to which they belong; and that a distinct badge should be worn, on the left arm of all persons neutralized by this treaty, which should be delivered to them exclusively by the military authority. And then, as though it were an acknowledgment that such benevolent resolutions and determinations could only have existence through the benign influence of Christ, the flag and the badge were ordered to bear "*a red cross upon a white field*," which, we may hope, shall be seen on every battle-field as a silent protest against war, while it gives the protection of neutrality to every man who brings succor to its victims.

With the obligations of the Genevan treaty resting upon them, and the influence of our Sanitary Commission, let us see what was effected during the recent Austro-Prussian-Italian war. The book of Dr. Evans affords us an opportunity of examining the testimony of an eye-witness. He is an American surgeon-dentist, resident in Paris, who has acquired great wealth and much distinction from the practice of his profession abroad. During our civil war he investigated the operations



of the Sanitary Commission and published in Paris a report on the same, which was widely circulated on the Continent, communicating the results of our experience as to the sanitary reform needed in armies. This publication so connected his name with this kind of work, that he became favorably known to the continental governments, and received autograph letters of thanks from the Empress of the French, the Queen of Holland, the Emperor of Austria, the Queen of Prussia, and others. We shall quote freely from Dr. Evans last book, as from the most reliable source of information. He betook himself to the seat of war with the view of studying the European Sanitary organizations and of comparing them with those of America. He says; "By repairing to the theatre of events in order to better examine the questions which had occurred to me, I considered that I was fulfilling a duty, the more so because, before the war, their Majesties, the King and Queen of Prussia, had repeatedly expressed to me their unqualified sympathy with the work accomplished by the United States Sanitary Commission, and had deigned to encourage me in the efforts I was making to propagate in Europe the idea of a Sanitary enterprise, similar to that which in America had rendered such great services to humanity."

Prussia had a Central Prussian Relief Society formed in February, 1864, which entered into active service during the Schleswig-Holstein war. It was an anomaly and without precedent in the military history of Europe. Through the agency of two members of this body a depot had been organized at Flensburg, from which lint, bedding, instruments and alimentary supplies were furnished to the surgeons as they were needed. The army preparations were, however, nearly adequate to the demands of the war, with the exception of over-crowded hospitals which resulted in great mortality among the patients. The Relief Society appealed to the people to receive the wounded soldiers into their houses. "To this appeal the population responded with such eagerness that it was impossible for the society to accept all the offers made. From that moment overcrowding of the hospitals ceased, wounds healed more readily,

and the proportionate amount of mortality decreased considerably." It was believed that these results contributed greatly to the adoption of the Genevan treaty. After the close of the Schleswig campaign "the Society remained in active service with the view of preparing during peace the means of succoring the wounded, should war again break out."

Dr. Evans was struck with the presence of large numbers of hospital attendants at the railway stations. "They wore upon the arm the badge of the international society—the red cross upon a white ground. They were there awaiting each convoy, and ready to render assistance to whatever wounded soldiers, friends or enemies, the train might bring. I was reminded of the volunteer hospital attendants of the American Sanitary Commission, who also prepared at the stations "Refreshment Rooms" and "Homes" for the sick and wounded, returned from the fields of battle." There were, however, no female attendants, as there had always been, where practicable, in our country.

In April, 1866, the Prussian Society was incorporated by the King, and it was formally declared to be for the future the organ of public charity in the war. A stirring appeal was sent forth to the people by the society, urging a collection of resources, "so that if war breaks out we may be ready, with the blessing of God, to help our brothers, sons, relations and friends, who will go forth to defend the country." Local relief societies were formed on all sides, and these forwarded money or useful articles to the depot in Berlin. A Commissary-General and Inspector of the volunteer hospital service of the Prussian army—Count von Stollberg was appointed, who acquainted the Relief Society with the movements of the troops and the points where need was most urgent, and was a medium between the regular medical bureau and the society. The society was subject to the control of a central committee of twenty-four members, fifteen of whom were residents of Berlin.

The first place, where the benefit of the Prussian Relief Society was shown on a large scale, was Langensalza. An engagement was fought here June 28th, 1866, by a detachment of

Prussians against the Hanoverian forces which were on their way to effect a junction with the Bavarian troops. The resources of the Prussian army were insufficient to meet the wants of the wounded. Count von Stollberg received information at five o'clock in the afternoon that there were 1500 wounded at Langensalza, absolutely in want of bread. "Immediately, the central committee, with a most commendable activity, responded to the call; after midnight, three special convoys left the Berlin station, bearing the succors of the Sanitary Society upon the field of battle. \* \* \* One of its members accompanied the expedition, as also eight physicians, and several male and female volunteer nurses, among whom were six deaconesses of the Institution of Protestant Sisters." At Gotha vehicles were furnished for transporting the supplies, so that they reached the place of want on the following morning. Here there were more than 1000 Hanoverians and 3000 Prussians wounded. Stromeyer, the famous German surgeon, was in charge with excellent assistants, but his force was inadequate to the demands. The arrival of the special supplies brought comfort and relief to the wounded, and the Sanitary flag was an ensign of joy to all.

This first effort of the Prussian Society was surpassed however by its exertions after the great battle of Sadowa, where it "proved in a splendid manner the great services a work based upon the free co-operation of a united people can render in these solemn moments." More than five hundred thousand soldiers were engaged in the fight of July 3rd, 1866. Over forty thousand wounded were left on the field. These were entirely in charge of the Prussian surgeons, who treated all the wounded alike, in conformity to the treaty of Geneva. "For three days and nights the Sanitary companies were exploring the battle-field in search of the wounded." Supplies having, however, been sent to Gitschin the day before the battle, they were at hand immediately as the need arose. These were followed in quick succession by convoys containing hospital supplies and even ice. Evans remarks: "what particularly struck me in the manner of acting of this society, was that, notwithstanding

the enthusiasm exclusively Prussian and patriotic, which animated every soul at this time, and conducted the Prussians to brilliant successes, it did not abjure an instant its international mission. It distributed its aid impartially to the children of Prussia and to their adversaries."

In addition to its labors on the field and in the hospital the Relief Society established grand *Buffets* at the principal railway stations, where agents furnished relief to the sick and wounded as they passed by. Meat, beef, soup, wine bread, coffee and cigars were among the articles furnished at these stations. Adopting another American idea—books and papers were procured in quantities for distribution among the hospitals, and among "the improvised libraries there was a large number of Italian, Hungarian and Slavonian works; the sick and wounded of the Austrian army, nursed by Prussia, being much more numerous than the Prussian sick, and composed in part of Italians, Hungarians and Poles, it was determined that they should profit alike by the benefits of the measure adopted." Aid to the convalescent in the shape of money was also given, when the circumstances required it.

As in our own country during the war, there were other organizations, besides that which had a national character, in Prussia, whose members contributed successfully to the succoring of the wounded. The Knights of St. John—a Protestant order—were active throughout the war. They claim to be the direct continuators of the old order and devote themselves to the work of nursing sick and wounded soldiers. Count Stollberg was the Grand Master. The knights were generally at the same time delegates of the Relief Society, and were placed at the head of the depots, hospitals, &c., and, on account of their experience, were most useful in the prompt execution of all plans of relief. The Catholic Knights of Malta rivalled, in zeal and good works, the Knights of St. John. Then there were countless Relief Societies, Private Hospitals, Sisters of Charity, Catholic nuns, and Protestant Deaconesses, all devoting their energies to the task of aiding the physician, to restore to health those whose death seemed inevitable, or to render less painful the last hours of those visited by death.

In other parts of Germany also, the people were active in their efforts to secure contributions of money and articles necessary for the wounded. After the war had begun, Relief Societies were formed at Dresden, Leipsig, Chemnitz and Zittau in Saxony. "When the trains of wounded arrived at Dresden, such a number of women presented themselves at the hospitals, that the medical officers had to intervene and refuse them access; they brought their offerings pell-mell, moved by a noble sentiment of compassion, but without order and without discernment." Order was introduced into the volunteer work by the efforts of General von Reitzenstein, the President of the Relief Society. Under proper organization and control the money and articles, which were sent to Dresden from all parts of the kingdom, were judiciously and advantageously distributed. In Würtemberg the local societies were all auxiliary to a *Sanitäts Verein* at Stuttgart, which was under the direct patronage of the Queen, who was the pioneer in the work of organizing plans of relief, and who personally stimulated the courage of the patients, in the hospitals, by her presence and words. The *Sanitäts Verein* not only furnished supplies, but forwarded male and female nurses to the hospitals at Tauberbischofsheim and the neighboring villages after the battles on the Mein. In Baden an organization of ladies, the *Badischer Frauen Verein* had been established in 1859 at Carlsruhe by the Grand Duchess, to meet the probable wants of a war then seemingly pending. Its central committee instituted, in 1861, "schools for the nurses to be employed in taking care of sick and wounded soldiers." These schools were attached to the hospitals of Carlsruhe, Pforzheim, and Mannheim. After a course of theoretical and practical instruction, under the medical officers, lasting for three months, the women attending undergo an examination and receive certificates setting forth their capacities. "When they have terminated their instruction, those who return home in the city or country, remain nevertheless under the direction of the local Sanitary committee. A part of the nurses stay in the hospitals where they perfect themselves. Lastly some are employed in an establishment at Carlsruhe,

founded by the Society, and nurse the sick at home gratuitously in time of peace." This *Frauen Verein* acted as one of the International Societies of Relief during the war. Their record of labor efficiently performed was a brilliant one. "They fulfilled their arduous duties to the full satisfaction of the physicians and the wounded, and succeeded in conquering the distrust which they encountered on their arrival upon the scene of action. Besides, the material service which they rendered, their excellent influence full of gentleness, the order which they knew how to organize in the small hospitals committed to their care, and the consolation which they diffused in the hearts of the suffering, show of what great importance it is that women, whose education places them above the ordinary level, should consecrate themselves to the care of hospitals." A similar result was obtained by the organization of women in Bavaria. Evans bears full testimony to the thorough manner in which the obligations of the Genevan Convention were fulfilled by these nations, all of whom had ratified the treaty of 1864.

In Italy the good effects of an adherence to the Genevan Treaty were perceived, from the opening of the war. Indeed, the Milanese Committee of the Italian Association of Relief for sick and wounded soldiers, was organized, before the adoption of the Treaty, as early as June 15, 1864. It appealed to the medical societies of Italy to form similar associations, which eventually recognized the Milanese Committee as the central committee, although in fact, when active operations began, Florence shared with Milan the honor of controlling the general operations of the relief service. During the whole war the Italians are said to have shown remarkable zeal and activity. "The physicians distinguished themselves by their zeal and readiness to enlist under the glorious banner of the Society. During the days of Custoza, they were seen upon the field of battle succoring the wounded, and, faithful to the mission of the Society, attending Italians and Austrians indiscriminately.

\* \* And here, as elsewhere, it was the women especially, who, by their courage, their energy and devotion, aided the Relief Society to do all that it accomplished."



Having glanced at what was done in and by nations that had ratified the Geneva Treaty, let us see how things were managed in Austria, which had refused to join in the ratification. The task imposed by the situation upon Austria was less arduous than that assumed by Prussia. The latter was called upon to provide not only for its own wounded, but for the large number of sick and wounded Austrians that fell into its hands. Its chief glory consisted in the execution of this task, "especially through the spontaneous and continued co-operation of its sanitary associations; and the force and grandeur of these institutions consisted in their having an *international* character, which enlisted their sympathies alike for friends and enemies." In Austria the sanitary service of the army was defective, and efforts were made by private associations to meet the defects, but "they were wanting in that co-operative character which was the glory of similar enterprises organized in the United States and in Germany." The first sanitary association formed was the *Patriotischer Damenverein*, which had really been in operation during the Holstein war. This was under the Princess Scharzenberg, who gave up her palace, with all the buildings therewith connected, to the society, for hospital purposes. The Sisters of Charity officiated as nurses. The hospital of St. Francis was also superintended by ladies of the higher classes of society, working under the direction of the Baroness von Löwenthal. But the principal sanitary organization was the *Patriotic Society*, composed exclusively of men, which resembled the American organization, in having volunteer hospital corps prepared for duty in hospitals, at railway stations and wherever need seemed to exist. All classes of society were united in its membership, and showed great readiness in the performance of its work of philanthropy. One of the hospitals had been placed in charge of the *Damen Comité*, and became noted from the small mortality that marked its records. Even when the cholera broke out in this establishment, two of these ladies remained at their posts, although many had been driven away by fear, and devoted themselves for several weeks to the business of cooking, and nursing three hundred persons.

The record of honest, well-meant efforts for the benefit of the suffering has been made by Austria as well as by the two other powers engaged in the short but exceedingly disastrous war. Its defects arose from the want of systematic co-operation, and Austria has recognized these by agreeing, since these events, to the Genevan Treaty.

Dr. Evans' testimony to the excellency of our sanitary exertions is very important, as he was an eye-witness of all he relates. He says: "If I were now asked what improvements I have been able to observe in Germany and Italy, upon the work instituted as early as 1861, in America, by the United States Sanitary Commission, I am compelled to acknowledge that I have nowhere seen a striking amelioration, an improvement worthy of being signalled, either in the organization of the materiel of the ambulances, or in the personal composition of the Sanitary Societies. I will even say, and I certainly speak without prejudice or partiality, that it is regrettable that the experience acquired in the United States, during four years of murderous war, was not turned to better profit; it is particularly lamentable that many of the excellent measures employed by the American Sanitary Commission were not adopted by the Relief Societies in Germany, and lastly, that a good number of American inventions appropriate to the service of ambulances were not employed by the different committees."

It is pleasant to present an outline of the humane efforts of men to relieve suffering during the prevalence of the scourge of war. There has been so much on the pages of past and present history of an opposite character, that the soul sickens at the recital. At times there have been notable instances of a recognition of the rights of the sick and wounded to kindness and attention, but even our so-called civilized nations have too often forgotten what was due to a prostrate foe. England, during her Indian war, and probably in the late sack of the Abyssinian Magdala, has blotted her escutcheon with many foul stains; while Mahometans, like the famous Saladin, who allowed the Chevaliers of St. John to operate with the wounded after he had conquered Jerusalem, have at times won imperishable credit for their considerate care of conquered enemies.

The Christian Church has shown its practical recognition of the peaceful mission conferred by the divine Master, in all the humane operations that have brightened the pages of war. Its members have not hesitated to work with those who have banded themselves together for sanitary service, being instant in their labors for the comfort of the bodies and the salvation of the souls of the suffering. Were it free from divisions and bound together by the cords of unity that should encompass it, all such organizations would arise from *its* midst. The noble, self-denial and sufferings of Deaconesses, Sisters of Charity, and countless other societies belonging alone to its members, bear testimony to what the religion of Christ can do when its members are actuated by its spirit of love. But, until the Millennial period of unity shall come, we must not despise the efforts of any organization formed for philanthropic ends. It is the Christian's duty to aid these as far as may be in his power; to work assiduously in their ranks, striving to give them as much of a religious character as possible. They must be cherished and fostered because of the good they endeavor to accomplish. All this need not interfere with the prayerful recognition of the Church as the proper source through which benevolence and philanthropy flow as so many forms of that Christian charity, which bears as its motto: Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth the rain on the just and on the unjust.

## ART. VI.—CONDITIONS OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP.\*

BY REV. E. V. GERRHART, D.D.

Youth bears the closest relation to manhood. The one grows out of and depends upon the other. This we all admit, though young men generally do not feel the full force of the truth. The relation comprehends the entire constitution, physical, intellectual, and moral.

This fact imparts special importance and solemnity to your college course. It exerts a determining influence, for good or evil, on the whole of your future life, upon your intelligence and scholarship, your character and conduct, your position in society; and it even reaches out into eternity.

The result of your college education, whatever it may be, is the product mainly of two factors. The one is the *Teacher*, the other the *Student*, or the *Master* and the *Disciple*. The one is the ability and fidelity of the Faculty of instruction, the other the diligence and moral earnestness of the student. As this subject, the relation of Master and Disciple, was handled very clearly and forcibly by the President of the College in his opening address, nearly two years ago, it is not my intention nor is there any occasion, to take it up at this time. What I propose to say now will be rather a further development and application of the same general idea.

I propose to consider some of the *essential conditions of success on the part of the student*.

Punctuality, regular attendance, close application to study, thorough preparation of every lesson, attention in the classroom, and a lively interest in knowledge for its own sake, are

\* An address to the Students of Franklin and Marshall College, delivered April 16th, 1868. Published by request.

of primary importance. These things come first. Without them nothing, or but very little comparatively, can be accomplished. These conditions lie at the threshold of education and scholarship. No degree of ability, fidelity and efficiency of a teacher can compensate for the want of interest and devotion on the part of the student.

These conditions lie on the surface, as it were; every one can see them with half an eye. There are some others, however, that lie deeper, and are therefore more necessary still, in order that a good College may accomplish the work which it proposes to itself, and that the diligence and lively interest of a student may not issue in a failure.

*A young man must pursue his College course in a spirit, and with a purpose, which are in harmony with the idea of the College, and the end which it proposes to itself.*

The different parts of a College curriculum are not separate. They are not brought together mechanically, but they sustain an internal relation to each other—each one to all the rest. Mutually interdependent, they are animated, or at least ought to be animated, by one principle; each one performs a function peculiar to itself and is related to an end which is common to all.

These parts may therefore be called branches, because they are so many living forces working together toward one common end. Making the most general distinction, we may divide them into *formal* and *material*. The *formal* are chiefly Mathematics and Logic. Mathematics is ideal and metaphysical. It is the pure product of thought in one particular sphere. It begins with the general idea of *quantity*. Then passing from the idea to its postulates, which are called axioms and by which all mathematical processes are governed, the science unfolds this idea according to the laws of thought. Mathematics is the result of a logical process in the sphere of ideal quantity.

Matter and mind being but different members of one whole, the powers and forces of nature correspond to the categories and laws of thought. Indeed the unseen, all comprehending forces of nature, and the laws of the human mind are in their last

ground, not indeed identical, but yet *one*. Both forms of being embody and express the thought and will of the Logos, which is the free creating principle of matter and spirit alike.

This profound truth, which is both Christian and metaphysical, underlies and sustains the application of the formal truths of mathematics to the sensible objects of the natural world. Possessing an intuitive sense of the oneness of matter and mind, and of the correspondence of the intention and fixed forces of matter with the generic forms and laws of thought,—though few persons stop to reflect upon this principle, and many are even disposed to deny it when it is affirmed,—we proceed by a spontaneous action of the mind and without reflection to investigate nature, and construct the various natural sciences in obedience to the formal truths of pure mathematics. Natural Science is the product of mind investigating and reflecting upon the material world according to forms and laws of thought which are unfolded from itself and certified in consciousness.

The formal science of Logic is not limited to the idea of quantity, but is general. Logic unfolds all the categories of thought and all the laws of thought. Hence it is the plastic power of all scientific inquiry and all scientific results, in the sphere of matter and mind. Geology and astronomy, anatomy and physiology, psychology and philosophy, ethics and aesthetics, and theology in all its departments;—all derive their scientific character from logical thinking.

The study of both logic and mathematics possesses great value as a discipline of the mind—of the thinking and reasoning powers. But to devote yourself to either one for this end only, to make either one its own end absolutely, involves a perversion of the great design of the College. For though each one is its own end, it is such however only relatively. The ultimate purpose lies beyond. These formal sciences are subordinate to practical life, to history, and to the material sciences: but subordinate to these interests as they themselves in turn are by faith made subordinate and subservient to the true ultimate end of man and of creation, which is no other than the Logos Himself. The original ground and the ultimate absolute end both of all existence and of all scientific knowledge, are one and the same.



The *material sciences* are those which deal with real objects. These are the various subdivisions of nature; then man himself as to body, soul and spirit; and finally God, and the reciprocal relation of God and man. Thus we get the various sciences of nature, the various sciences terminating on man, and the various sciences terminating on God and the revelation of Himself in the person of Christ.

The various material sciences are not co-ordinate nor externally associated. They are organized. Each one holds a place and performs a function relatively to all the rest, and relatively to the end of all. They take rank, each one according to the relative position of its corresponding object. The mineral is lower than the plant, and subordinate to it. The plant is lower than the animal, and subordinate to it. So is the animal, related to man. The mineral and the plant are both taken up in, and condition the existence of the animal. So do these three lower kingdoms condition the idea and existence of man as he takes them up into himself. Man finally, being lower than God, finds his end in Him, and in Him alone. But God becomes an object of knowledge and will, truly, only as being present and related to faith in the Person of Christ. And Christ is real and true for faith only when acknowledged as the head of His kingdom, and present in it.

This order of the objects of knowledge determines the relative position and order of the corresponding sciences. The lowest object of thought determines the lowest science; and the highest object of thought determines the highest science. The intermediate objects determine the position and relative importance of the intermediate sciences. The sciences standing lowest on the scale are related to the highest not directly, but only through those which are intermediate. All the sciences, for example, that deal directly with inorganic matter, or lifeless objects, are lowest on the scale, such, for example, as mineralogy and geology. This judgment, however, does not imply that they are unimportant, or unworthy of the attention of the greatest minds. By no means. But we mean that their relation to the highest, in the providence of God, is mediated

by all the other sciences, and chiefly by metaphysics, including psychology, logic and philosophy in general; and most of all is the relation mediated and conditioned by a true idea of God, as Creator and Father.

Hence we must reason from the earth to God, not directly, but through the medium of animated nature, and, above all, through the constitution of man. The objective relation of the earth to God is concrete, not abstract. Therefore must the science of the earth stand in a concrete relation to the knowledge of God; that is, it is valid only in as far as it is organically connected with zoology, psychology and theology. An attempt to draw an inference from the present constitution of the rocks, or from any geological facts, abstracted from their internal relation to all other kingdoms and forces of the universe, directly to God and to the divine acts of creation and redemption, is in the highest degree one-sided, arbitrary and superficial, and must be false necessarily. As well might a philosopher infer the nature of human personality directly from the anatomy of his big toe.

Taking this view of the various branches of your College course, you see that their relation to one another and the design of prosecuting them is grounded in the Christian idea of God. This idea gives position, spirit, character, force and purpose to every study, to Mathematics and Logic, to Mineralogy and Botany, to Greek and Latin, no less than to Philosophy, History and Ethics; assigning to each one a function corresponding to its objective location. Now, it is an important condition of success that you prosecute your studies in harmony with the genius of the Institution—in harmony with the relation which every study bears to its fundamental idea and ultimate purpose. You must not only read and think—not only learn your lessons like boys, and recite perfectly, which is something however which I hold to be of primary importance, but you must stand in a true ethical relation to every study, and to the ultimate end of the whole College course; otherwise you will contradict the College. You may be punctual, regular, diligent and gentlemanly, and yet from the time you enter the Freshman Class until your Commencement day, you may be waging war against true scientific

knowledge. Whilst each study claims to be pursued in its own spirit and for its own purpose, you may pursue it in a foreign spirit, and for a purpose for which it does not exist. You seem to be in the right place and have on the harness, but, like Saul of Tarsus, you kick against the pricks; and you fail to attain to that kind of thorough scholarship which the College is striving to promote.

A second condition of success is that *the student, by his own act, reproduce for himself the knowledge which he acquires.* This point, for want of time, I will consider but briefly. In the address to which I have already referred, this subject was fully discussed.

Dr. Rauch used to say that the human mind was not a wall into which he could strike a nail and then hang science and knowledge upon it like a coat. Scholarship, and particularly Christian scholarship, is not traditional. The teacher cannot hand over a science to a student, as the bookseller hands a book to a purchaser. Nor does a student possess any such receptive capacity. He may learn the text-book by heart. He may commit all the parts of a science, and all definitions of science to memory. He may be able to answer all questions accurately, answers to which he has learned from the text book and the Professor. But if he does no more, he cannot become a thinking man, not a scholar. He is only a pack-horse loaded with other men's wares. His knowledge is like undigested potatoes in his stomach. He is a slave in the Republic of scholarship and letters, not a freeman. But unlike the negro, the Professor can't knock off his shackles; that he must do himself. He must work himself up into freedom and the rights of citizenship, and all the masters of science will bid him God-speed.

A student must be active; not simply passive. He must take up the subject for himself, and in his own way, using the book and the instruction of the Class-room as a guide, help and support. He must penetrate the science, apprehend its principle as it is in itself and in its relations, cultivate the principle in the depths of his mind, and thus create anew in himself the whole structure of the science. Then knowledge becomes internal,

then the ideas of other men are taken up into, and become a part of yourself. Like the food you eat, they are freely digested, and turned into the flesh and blood of your spiritual being. Then you become a freeman. The knowledge acquired does not lie heavy on your mental stomach; but it is refreshing and invigorating; and you will become stronger and freer the longer you study and the more knowledge you acquire.

Of course we do not mean that every young man can thus be perfectly reproductive during his College course. But here is the place where he must make the beginning, and cultivate the true spirit and method of study. Then he may expect afterwards to mature his new creating power. But if he is content to pass through College in a traditional spirit, satisfied simply with receiving and holding what the College teaches, but not by the creative energy of his own reason, striving to produce it anew for himself, then his College career will be in a great measure a failure. He is likely to graduate an intellectual dyspeptic; and the undigested food of learning and science may give him pain, and make him irritable as long as he lives; or like an ox, turned into a clover field for the first time in the spring of the year, that eats more clover than he digests, his personal dignity is wonderfully inflated, and he is in great danger of bursting.

The last condition I propose to mention is, that a student must reproduce scientific knowledge for himself, not only *positively but also negatively, and in its principal negative relations*. This condition I regard as both necessary and in the highest degree important.

By reproducing scientific truth negatively, I mean that a young man who wishes to become a thorough, sound, and firm Christian scholar, is required to recognize the full force of the principal false divergent tendencies of science, meet them, acknowledge the truth which they involve, and then overcome them radically. In other words, every truth, every valid science, and the principle of every science, has its *cognate errors*. They are not imported. They proceed from the study of truth itself; they grow forth from it like fungi from a tree. No error is pure error, no heresy is pure heresy, no false system of philosophy

or religion, is unmixed falsehood. We may call error an abnormal development of truth, or a false tendency of truth. It is conditioned by the presence of sin in the world, which is a divisive, disorganizing force in mind and matter, and poisons every relation and sphere of human life. This evil force is radical. Sin lies at, and in the tap-root. Sin is a principle in the germ of the egg, and is hatched with the living being, and in it. It is hatched with a true system of science, and in it. Like life, it works from within, outwardly. It works silently and unconsciously. It works at all times, and in all persons, and in all spheres of human life. It works under the garb of truth, and logic. Like the devil, whose child it is, sin clothes itself in a garment of light.

It follows that in order to know the truth thoroughly, and be confirmed in the faith and knowledge of it, we must know not only what the truth is, but we must know also what the truth is not. We must know positively and negatively. We must be able to affirm, and to deny, concerning truth. Passing through such a dialectic process, a student becomes firm, as well as thorough. Hence every student who hopes to become a Christian scholar, a comprehensive and stable thinker, must pass through a period of temptation. Not that it is necessary to fall into error and for a time embrace falsehood for truth. But it is necessary to become acquainted with error, recognize the truth which underlies it, and appreciate properly its apparent claims to regard.

Sin being a general principle and a concrete power, temptation is for mankind a general necessity. It is a *necessity*, and the necessity is *general*. The fall of Adam was not unavoidable and necessary, but the temptation to sin was. Though created good and righteous, he had not only to choose the good, but to choose the good in opposition to the evil—God in opposition to Satan. To do this he possessed the requisite capacity. But in the exercise of his freedom, he mysteriously determined himself by the evil instead of the good, and thus fell under the bondage of a foreign power. So was the temptation of our blessed Saviour, the second Adam, a necessity, in order that he

might become perfect in righteousness. Being a true man he had not only to do the will of his Heavenly Father, but to do it also in opposition to the will of Satan. Therefore the principle of evil had really to confront Him, under some form, in the person of Satan; and he had to enter into a conflict, terrible and real. In the exercise of his freedom, He, unlike the first Adam, determined himself according to the will of God, and against the will of Satan. Thus on the one hand he resisted Satan and overcome him, and on the other he became stronger and more perfect in righteousness and holiness.

The same principle is applicable to all persons. Every young man must be tempted of evil. I do not say that it is necessary to do wrong; God forbid! But he must see and feel the force of evil, under one form or another, in order that he may say *no*, emphatically, and repudiate it. For he becomes moral by a two-fold act of his own will; he chooses the good against the demands of the evil, and he resists temptation in the strength of the good. He has to repeat in his own life the great conflict of Christ with Satan in the wilderness. Then, he becomes firm and strong, as well as good.

Now what is true of the will and moral conduct, is equally true of reason and thought. As there are tendencies and temptations to wrong-doing, so there are tendencies and temptations to false thinking. Both are unavoidable. You cannot escape them. They must be met. They cannot be ignored. You cannot, for example, say, I will have nothing to do with the false system of pantheism, or dualism. They are exploded. I will study only a sound system of philosophy and true science; that is sufficient for me; for I must live by truth and not by error. So you may think. But if you do think so, you deceive yourself. True, dualism has been exploded many times over, but do not forget one thing; you have not yet exploded it, and therefore, is not for you an exploded system.

Your father, has successfully resisted the temptations to immorality, which confronted him in his youth. His moral victory, and moral character, secure to you inestimable advantage, but he cannot transmit his moral character to you. You must



pass through a conflict similar in kind to that through which he passed. You must acquire your character for yourself, and the conflict may be even more severe than his was.

Now, the relation in which you stand to your teacher, educationally, is analogous to the relation in which you stand, morally, to your father. No one can bequeath to you directly the benefit of his intellectual and scientific victory. Those thinkers who have exploded dualism, have done it for themselves, not for you. What they have written and said, may render you important assistance. It may be ten times easier for you to surmount this false system than if these profound and correct thinkers had not lived before you; but the victory achieved by others does not supersede the necessity of achieving the same victory for yourself. You must lay hold of the false system, study it, see the truth which underlies it, discriminate between the true and the false, and thus overcome the system in its principle. You must do for yourself, in your own way, what they have done for themselves in their way; otherwise you may ignore a false system, and even denounce it as absurd, and yet at the same time stand under the power of the very principle which underlies the system. You may denounce rationalism from the rationalistic stand-point of observation. You may denounce gnosticism in many of its forms, yet be a gnostic yourself. This fact has been illustrated times without number in the history of individuals and of communities. And there is no possible escape from this contradiction, unless you go to work in earnest, and digest and reproduce truth for yourself, under its negative aspect and in its negative relations, as well as in its positive aspects. I lay special emphasis on this condition of thorough and successful Christian scholarship. As you can come into full possession of truth, only by entering into the truth and embracing it in virtue of your own rational activity, so you can be delivered from the power of error only by appreciating error properly, and in the light and strength of truth, thinking it out logically as error for yourself. Then you may know the truth positively and negatively. You may know what is truth, and what is not truth. When you have come to occupy this position,

you will be confirmed in faith, and scientific knowledge, and sound philosophy, and true Christianity. Your house will stand on a rock; the winds may blow upon it, and the rushing waters dash against it, but it will not fall.

Perhaps some of you, conceding what I have said, may now raise the question in your own minds; If it be necessary to reproduce truth both positively and negatively, each one for himself, how can the mass of good people, who have no liberal education, stand firm in the faith and knowledge of the truth? since they have neither the inclination, nor the time, nor the ability, to engage in philosophical inquiries. This question is in place, but it offers no difficulty.

The necessity of reproducing and overcoming systems of error, does not pertain to men in general. It pertains only to thinking men, to students and scholars. All men think, but they do not make thinking an object of thought. All men stand in a system of philosophy, but they are not all conscious of the system in which they stand. Your position is a different one. You propose to acquire a liberal education. You propose to become thinking men. Therefore you are bound to meet the obligations of thinking men. So soon as a man begins to think, he is by the very act under the power of strong tendencies to error, for these tendencies are latent in the human reason, and are developed with reflection and thought. Little infants are innocent. They do no wrong. But so soon as they begin to desire, to will, and to act, the disposition to wrong-doing shows itself; and the parent is required to command one thing and to prohibit another. So too with conscious thought. So long as we do not think philosophically, we are not exposed to the danger of holding any false system consciously. But whenever we rise into the sphere of conscious reflection, the inherent tendencies to error make themselves felt. Then we are either carried away by the current of these false tendencies, or we must appreciate, master, and overcome them. Medicine is the profession of physicians. Law the profession of the jurist. Each one must be qualified to meet the demands of his own profession, or fail miserably. But to think correctly, to mould

the thinking of the community in general, to guide the people in the way of truth, and deliver them from the power of error, is the high and noble vocation of students and scholars. Hence it is they particularly, who are required to meet all the important conditions, positive and negative, of sound Christian scholarship.

The discussion of this subject suggests several practical inferences. But I will mention only one.

The most important element of a student, and of successful scholarship, is the *ethical* element. It is a matter of fundamental importance that you be *predisposed* in favor of what is right and true. Truth and error are mutually exclusive. There is no neutral ground. You cannot be indifferent. You cannot serve two masters. You will be a *priori* in sympathy with the one or the other. And if you be predisposed in favor of unbelief and error, you are in great measure disqualified for appreciating and receiving the truth, whether in the sphere of philosophy, morals or religion. For you cannot judge of truth from the stand-point of error. The opposite you can do. Of error you can judge from the stand-point of truth; just as you judge of the wrong in the light of what is right. But to judge of truth you must first enter into its own sphere in the spirit of faith. God is before Satan, and is the negative condition of his diabolical character. The good is older than the evil. Faith goes before unbelief. Unbelief is only a perverted unfolding of the principle of faith. See to it then that you possess an earnest moral purpose; that you cultivate the desire to be delivered from the bondage of sin and error, and to rise into the light of truth; and that you are always in sincere sympathy with what is good. See to it that your heart and will are in a right posture relatively to Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life, Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God.

## ART. VII.—THE FAITH OF CHRIST.

BY REV. GEO. B. RUSSELL. A. M.

Jesus Christ is the Fountal Source of life, light, grace, truth, faith, and of our whole redemption. He is the life of the world, This life, becomes the light of men (John i. 4). Grace and truth came by Him (John i. 17) to our lost race. He is also, the Beginner and Finisher of our faith (Heb. xii. 2); so that we now may have righteousness by faith (Rom. iv. 10); and therefore also, being justified by faith (Rom. v. 1), we have peace with God. He is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and complete redemption (1 Cor. i. 30).

As the opened fountain of eternal life (John xiv. 6, viii. 37), we are accustomed to hear men own that He is also become the resurrection power (John xi. 25), bringing immortality to our dying race (2 Tim. i. 10); so that even though we die, yet shall we live. The fountain too, of divine love, He is commonly acknowledged, in some sense, to be by almost all Christians. The *love* of God, shed abroad in the Christian's heart is readily referred to its fountain head, Jesus Christ, who was given as the expression of Divine love for fallen man, lost in sin and doomed to unending misery and woe.

But when it is claimed for *faith*, that the same analogous relation holds between God and man, as that existing between Him and us in the mutual bond of *love*, there is not the same ready acknowledgment of the force of the truth. The common notion, which does not hesitate to own that love has a divine origin and source, is prone to refer faith to the merely human, rather than to the divine-human life as its primal ground and power. Its ground and origin is thought to be only in man's soul, rather than primarily in the life of Christ; and its outgrowth and exercise is therefore commonly regarded only in the

sphere of the human, rather than the divine-human, first in the person of Christ and then only, and because of that, in the life of His disciples.

It will of course be said that faith is a gift of God; but so also, are health and strength, vision and hearing, speech and reason. Faith must therefore come from God in a sense more directly related to the divine and supernatural, than any of these merely natural endowments bestowed by our Creator on man. So that whatever faith is, in its first ground and source, as well as in its human exercise as a principle condition of our Christian religion; there will be found to be something vastly more than the common popular notion holds it to be, for a large part at least of our modern Protestant theological thinking.

*Justification by Faith* is of course generally admitted to be the most cardinal doctrine of Protestantism. But, if its importance is to be maintained, there must be a more correct sense of what is meant by faith itself, as the justifying principle, than that which attaches to the popular notion and is now so prevalent. With many, it is the merest fiction; with others, it is sometimes altogether notional; and with others, still, it is only an exercise of human thought, which by some rational process produces what they are pleased to call faith. Then again, it is made to mean, from another view, a crass Pelagian power working from the human will outwardly towards God; and so, being itself the Saviour, an autonomic saving power, instead of being the supernatural bond between man and our only Saviour Jesus Christ.

Accordingly, it is too often found that those who prate most vaporingly of what is thus popularly denominated "Justification by faith," are just those who are most exposed to the danger of falling away from the true ground of justification altogether. Not those, we read, who cry most, "Lord, Lord!" shall be owned by the heavenly Bridegroom—but they who do the will of God. As without faith, it is impossible to please Him; so must we find faith in its true ground, and thence receive it, if we would enjoy its saving benefits. If those who have the truth, hold it in unrighteousness, even they will be called into judgment.

## WHAT THEN IS FAITH?

Its fundamental importance is sufficient apology for pressing the question. It has indeed been answered from various stand-points; but each one has its own peculiar aspect, and so the answers are manifold.

Paul tells us (Heb. xi. 1) that faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. This, in the mechanical mode of thinking, so common in our day, may seem at first, all plain enough. Just here is, however, the greatest danger of taking a wrong bearing; and so, failing to apprehend the cardinal truth of "the substance" itself, and of "the evidence" authenticating the real, yet unseen verities.

Faith, moreover, or the grace reached by it, is *the gift of God* according to the same authority (Eph. ii. 8). Evidently the Apostle here includes all its contents. Jesus also, had already said to the woman of Samaria, "If thou knewest the *gift of God*, and who it is that saith unto thee," &c. (John iv. 10), she would have asked of Him, and He would have given unto her the *living water*. And when she then asked it, He gave her *faith*, and she immediately afterwards believed on Him. In the same sense, Paul calls the gift of God, eternal life through Jesus (Rom. vi. 23). And he thanks God for His unspeakable gift (2 Cor. ix. 15).

Now it is at once apparent, that there is a great deal more, in this view of faith, than is commonly received from the popular notion of what is meant by faith. The same kind of deeper meaning is found also in the apostle's reference to the converting and regenerating power of the *word* of God, where it means not only the gospel message, but the personal Word, the living incarnate truth, which many make to be nothing more than the letter of the Bible. So, indeed, with too many, faith is little if anything more than mere mechanical notion. Something that sets upon them by common habit or general traditional authority, blindly running into the common notion of the times or country in which they happen to live, is for them faith. Or, it may rise to a kind of self-adjusted reason, the



opinion or judgment formed by reflection and careful thought; but this, in the end, comes after all to land in sheer rationalism. In others, it may take the form of personal belief; or a well settled determination to hold for truth so much, and reject all else in the form of self-will, or by necessity of conviction from certain premises; as the devils are said to believe, *without having faith*.

There are others who have put for faith only the natural imaginations of galvanized fancy, clothing certain elements with æsthetic powers to create in them emotional and ideal life. Nearly allied to this, is the blind superstition of those who take every thing in nature to be divine signs and wonders. Thus, blind fate and bound authority, superstition and the tyranny of popular opinion run madly together. Fancy, notion and belief; imagination, reason and judgment on evidence; fiction, thought and conviction; these, either separately or taken together, are commonly regarded as the elements of faith, yet they can never reach its true ground. All that is of course only mere nature, and cannot ever rise higher than its own source.

Transcending all these natural powers of the human soul, FAITH yet rests really in man's nature as a supernatural endowment, a divine-human power. It follows, therefore, that no man can *think* himself into faith by any degree of logical reasoning. No amount of fancy can produce it. No exercise of human will can awaken it in man; and no settled conviction as belief, can bring it to pass. No multiplied force of blind, notional consent to the general authority of history, can generate faith. Circumstantial combination of all man's natural attributes cannot elevate his soul to the sphere of faith. In fine, mere human nature, though it has a capacity for faith, a receptivity for its supernatural power, yet could never awaken or beget faith in man's soul.

It is plain, however, from the most superficial observation that in some one of the natural human powers, or in the more or less full combination of all them, do men, for the most part, find what they commonly call faith.

Not, as a man credits the authenticated facts of history does

he hold the contents of faith, as divine truth. The truths of history, or science may be believed: so too the records of the Bible, in the same natural way, without saving effect. But that is not faith. The contents of faith are also believed; but faith is much more than belief. The judgment arising from reasoning on the logical relations of truths, gives opinion; but faith is vastly more than opinion.

Christian consent even has not always however been well settled in the general mind, as to the true principle and ground of faith. Because there is indeed a "mystery of faith," it cannot be measured rationally. It must be determined by its own principle. For us, it must always exist in such way, as that we may be able to apprehend its supernatural contents, on its own plane, and in its own sphere, in its own proper element, and by its own organ; and this can be done only in its own order, when once we have been apprehended first by it and endowed with its own wondrous power (Phil. iii. 12). When once we have begun to live only after that, sooner or later, can we come to know something of life. If we see, we can have a more clear idea of light and vision, than the man who has always been blind.

So, faith being a gift of God, when it "has come" into the soul, endows it with divine-human power, and gives it the miraculous capacity of taking firm hold of the supernatural. When once made "wise through faith in Christ," we can then come into right apprehension of Christian truth—not outside and beyond it first. Then can we be brought to "understand that the worlds were made;" and that "without faith it is impossible to please God." To become "obedient to the faith," is to give our hearty consent and submission to its authority, and an unwavering obedience to its demands. To "have faith in God," is first to have Christ's life formed within us, and then to submit our whole being to His rulings in our behalf, with a freedom that makes our will coincide at all points with His.

Present evidence of the unseen, and thus the real substance of the hoped for future good, the verities of grace authenticated to an organ higher than human reason, or will, or feelings; a

bond uniting our fallen nature to the life of God's dear Son—this in us, is faith. Having this supernatural power of “an endless life,” it can now truly be said of such an one, “thy faith has saved thee.” With this heavenly gift, even though it be small in quantity or weak in degree, yet has it the divine assurance that “according to thy faith, so shall it be done unto thee.” All this however comes first from THE FAITH OF CHRIST.

THE FAITH OF CHRIST IS THE JUSTIFYING PRINCIPLE.

Faith in the human soul, as the justifying principle, (Rom. v. 1), comes as the gift of God from its primary source, “the faith of Christ.” This is not one with the common expression, “faith in Christ.” That indeed is requisite; but in order to it, there must be first *The Faith of Christ*—not the system of Christian doctrine, or a history of recorded facts, as in the Bible; but the faith of Christ as that ruled in His own life. By the very proneness to make “the faith of Christ” to be equal only to faith in Him, we are admonished that we cannot be too careful as to how we hold the great truth of justification by faith. There is no more real justifying merit in the mere *act of believing*, or exercising faith towards Christ, than in any other human effort at work-righteousness. No such moral act is efficacious to this end. Only “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth” (Rom. x. 4). We must indeed exercise faith in the Lord Jesus, when God has bestowed that grace upon us, and commands us to believe the gospel.

Christ's obedience to the law of God is our only righteousness; even “that which is through *the faith of Christ*,” (Phil. iii. 9.) “The righteousness of God, which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*, unto all and upon all them that believe,” (Rom. iii. 22,) is, for us, the full release, in faith (which holds in the unity of our life with His life) from the condemnation of the law. The faith of Christ, therefore, is that heavenly grace, that divine gift, that supernatural power, by which we are enabled to look to Christ, and come to Him for salvation; and also, by which we apprehend the fact of our real justification in Him, and by which we come more and more to know and finally to enjoy the bless-

edness of our redemption. To this end Jesus sent Paul to the Gentiles; "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by *faith that is in Me*" (Acts xxvi. 18). From Him comes all objective faith. Thence if we receive it, we can exercise it toward Him, and so believe in Him.

In proportion as this is subjectively a more or less conscious part of our life, may we be said to have "little faith," or "great faith." The beginnings of faith may be weak and small; and we may with the holy apostles need to pray, "Lord increase our faith;" but if it be true and genuine, though comparatively only as a "grain of mustard seed" (Luke xvii. 6), yet has it most miraculous power. Once implanted in the soul by the power of God, it becomes the ruling principle of a new and endless life. Exercised as a divine-human power, it rules in the lives of all the saints.

Therefore they of old, though not having received the things promised, yet "embraced them and confessed" themselves under their power; "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens" (Heb. xi. 33, 34).

Saints are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation," says St. Peter (1 Eph. i. 5); and he further addresses them as "receiving the *end* of your faith, even the salvation of your souls" (1 Pet. i. 9). They who do believe in God that raised Christ up from the dead and gave Him glory, the same Apostle tells us, have this grace, "that your faith and hope might be in God." St. Paul declares that the life I now live, I live by the *faith of the Son of God*" (Gal. ii. 20). So he also reminds them that they "are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" and they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 7-26). Not by dead form, but by a living power, is this made to hold; "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith" (Gal. v. 5).

The form of the law or the lack of it availeth not; "but faith which worketh by love," is the availing power to justify the sinner (Gal. iii. 24).

Evidently this justification is by apprehending Christ in His whole divine-human life; and it is therefore not a mere fiction without any background of reality in the life of our Redeemer. Neither is it only a mere notion or thought simply in man, but something actually wrought by the faith of Christ. It must be more than vain fancy or imagination on the part of man.

Merely to feel one's self righteous is not to make it so, in fact. Nor to only think one's self righteous before God, is it after all, anything more than a vain thought.

If now, we are to be saved, we must have a righteousness that is a real part of us. We must have, therefore, in personal possession a righteousness, exceeding that of the Scribes and Pharisees—else we cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Not merely by some legal fiction, does God allow us to escape the penalties of His violated law. He cannot in truth declare us to be righteous and justified, when in fact, we have no sufficient righteousness to justify us; or, when it only exists in another, and holds no real relation to ourselves.

Nay: in order that God be just and yet the Justifier of them that believe, there must be in the person of the believer the real "righteousness of God, which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*, unto all and upon all them that believe" (Rom. iii. 22). They that are justified, are made just "freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (v. 24). In Him, we are justified by the faith of Christ. Thus it is that God, giving us the Holy Ghost, purifies the heart, (Acts xv. 9.)

Of all human endowments, the most comprehensive and the most absolutely real, is that which apprehends the supernatural, which is Faith. Only by this divine-human power we, believing in Christ, can obey God. This enables us to exercise "repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," (Acts xx. 21.) By this, we overcome the world, remain steadfast, fight the good fight of faith, and find it possible to please God. It is the *re-li-ga-re*, the rebonding of man with God, in

the power of an endless life. It is the essential element in the Christian religion.

In man's soul, the justifying principle must finally be lodged. The faith OF Christ is given to man; and man then has faith IN Christ. What justifies, is not the faith of man in Christ, so much as the faith of Christ, as the broad objective ground, out of which man's faith springs.

The justifying principle is then, not the subjective act of man's soul in exercising faith, by believing in Christ, but the principle of faith, with its divine-human contents in the Person of the God-man, made over to the human soul. Justification by faith, is that real making of man righteous and just before God, in the only and whole merits of Christ, "by the faith OF Him."

By a real union, mystically holding between Christ and believers, the righteousness of our Lord Jesus passes over to the true disciple, who is also a vitalized member, united to the Divine-human life of our Redeemer, like as the living branch is joined to the common life of the vine. Thus, we obtain in personal and real possession, "the righteousness of God, which is by the faith OF Jesus Christ." Only this can justify; and therefore only thus, can we be justified by faith. All other notions, or opinions, or fancies, or beliefs, however respectable in themselves, are the merest fictions and phantoms, imaginary and vain.

Man must have faith, before he can believe: just as he must have organs of speech, before he can speak; just as he must have an eye with all its functions complete, before he can see. So faith, the eye of the soul, is the organ for apprehending spiritual truth. The ability to apprehend divine truth savingly, is bestowed upon us, as the gift of God; by which, in the primal order of the supernatural, joining the human and divine in one, in "the faith of the Son of God," (Gal. ii. 20), we have been first apprehended. The carnal mind cannot perceive the things of the Spirit, for they must be spiritually discerned. So the revelation of grace is only for faith; and this holds in the order of the new creation, which is in Christ Jesus. In Him,



"we have access by faith unto this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God." (Rom. v. 2.) It anchors the soul to God.

From what has now been seen, it is plain that the general sense of the Holy Scriptures in the minds of the inspired Apostles, refers all the value of faith to Christ. This may in some popular sense be readily admitted; but it holds true, in a far deeper and higher sense, than is commonly confessed, when men speak of the value of faith. Man's faith is only efficacious, when it is of the same kind with Christ's faith.

We are thus brought near to the ground principle of Faith. Its objective and fontal source is evidently in the person of Christ. Its divine power holds therefore in the life of Jesus. The Scriptures which speak of His faith, the faith of the Son of God, the faith of Christ, and the faith of God, all refer broadly to the Personal Faith of Jesus' own life; rather than to some act of man going out towards Him.

CHRIST HIMSELF FIRST HAS DIVINE-HUMAN, PERSONAL FAITH;  
AND THEREFORE, HIS DISCIPLES CAN HAVE FAITH, AND BELIEVE IN HIM.

He is the Head, in every sense, of all believers. He has life in Himself, and therefore we have life, holding in one with Him. Our redemption holds, in all the stages of our humanity, in the fulness of His divine-human nature. He is Captain of our salvation. He is the source of our righteousness, having fully kept the law, and put honor upon it for us. He is the fullness of our obedience, having honored every precept and command. We love Him because He first loved us. He is the source of our life, of our love, and hence also, for the same necessary reason of our faith. But here again, men are liable to be mis-led by the common notion prevailing. They can talk of the life of God, and the life of Christ. They also speak of the love of God, and of the love of Jesus. And they refer man's regenerate life and man's Christian love to the fontal source of the same holding in God: but they have no power so to speak of faith.

Faith in God, and faith towards Jesus Christ, is as far as

they can go: making faith to hold only in the ground of man's life; by some magic force which may thus go out towards God or Christ, as a tendency of their belief towards an object—as a historical fact. But they have no power to speak in the apostolic sense of "the faith of God," (Rom. iii. 3,) "faith of Jesus Christ," (Rom. iii. 20,) "the faith of the Son of God," (Gal. ii. 20,) "the faith of Him," (Eph. iii. 12,) "the faith which is IN Christ," (2 Tim. iii. 15,) and "through the faith of Jesus Christ" (Phil. iii. 9). These, and kindred scripture passages, cannot by any fair construction, be made to mean only man's exercise of faith in Christ, or towards God—nor yet are they synonymous with the general Christian faith, as a system of doctrine.

Christ's own righteousness, as the Divine-human Redeemer, tempted, tried, in sufferings and triumphs, rests first of all in His own personal faith, by which He, the God-man, wrought obedience to the law. As He hence, becomes the Fountain of righteousness, having it in personal possession; so, He also becomes the Fountal source of man's faith, which rests in the ground and element of Christ's faith. As we only can have real righteousness by "the faith of Him;" so, the Christian life that we now live in the flesh, we "live by the faith of the Son of God." The human exercise of faith, only can find place, because of the divine-human faith of Christ's own Person. Subjective faith in us, holding primally in that of Christ, gives us "access with confidence *by the faith of Him*" into the grace of salvation. This faith, which in Christ became perfect obedience and complete righteousness, contains all the substance of redemption and the evidence of saving grace.

Jesus Christ's divine-human life with all its benefits is "the mystery of the faith," (1 Tim. iii. 9,) which must be held in a pure conscience. In the ground of that life, we are to hold our new life by the Holy Ghost; and our faith partakes of the nature of His; just as our life partakes also of the nature of His incarnate life (2 Pet. i. 4). As in Christ was first life in the new creation, before men can have new life in Him; so, by the faith of the God-man, we have the gift of God bestowed on us.

Man's nature has a capacity for faith, on the same ground only that it has a capacity for being saved in the life of Jesus, who mediates all grace to man. That is, because it was possible for the Son of God, to assume our human nature, in the mystery of the Incarnation, and so make an at-one-ment between God and man; therefore is it only possible also, for man's soul now to be joined in the bond of fellowship, with the *life and faith* of Jesus Christ.

Faith, that involves and includes all His obedience and righteousness, being wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, enables us to lay hold of and appropriate the benefits of His redemption. Thus His life becomes our life; His faith, our faith; and therefore, His righteousness, our righteousness (Rom. v. 1). Belief, merely, does not grow into Christian faith; but faith enables us to believe in Christ. It is so in the case of Peter's noble confession. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." To this Jesus at once replies, "Blessed art thou Simon Barjonah: flesh and blood" (mere nature) "hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." His power of faith to confess the "truth as it is in Jesus," was the gift of God. So always, in the ground of Christ's life, is the power of the human exercise of faith.

"Faith, 'tis a precious grace, where'er it is bestowed;

It boasts of a celestial birth, and is the gift of God."

Re-union of man's soul, or the life of humanity with the life of God, is the object and end of redemption's great work. This is brought to pass first in the person of the God-man, whose divine-human life united the two natures; and thereby raised our fallen life from the death of sin. The ground of that mysterious union, is the ground and fountal spring of all faith; therefore, also, of all the life we now inherit by virtue of that miraculous fact. Hence, there is in Him primarily, "the faith of God," even that which is by "faith of" (not only *in*) "Jesus Christ." Now since the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and having access by faith, and righteousness by faith, and therefore being justified by faith, the life that we now live we *can* "live by the faith, of the Son of God,"—not as some would only say, by faith *IN* the Son of God. This is the "faith

which is in Christ Jesus" first; and by His grace from Him, because ours, as the gift of God, when His divine-human life is formed in us, raising us to glory and honor and immortality and eternal life.

If there were no fountain, there could be no stream. As therefore, love is of God, for God is love in its fontal source, whence the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts; so faith, the supernatural endowment of the human soul, must have a divine source. And that holds manifestly in the Person and life of Jesus, whose life first itself "was made perfect through suffering." His faith wrought obedience which now by full righteousness re-binds our life to the life of God, through the mystery of His incarnate life in us. Is it then too much to affirm, that faith, the very principle that justifies us, ruled the humanity of our Lord Jesus, and that it wrought in Him that full obedience and perfect righteousness which taketh away the sin of the world?

THIS FAITH HOLDS IN THE CREED OBJECTIVELY FOR CHRIST'S DISCIPLES.

Christian Faith, the Apostles doctrine, has for us, the force of supernatural power, to confront us with the invisible and heavenly realities of the world to come, now being made known by the Church. Wrought in Christ's disciples, it reveals the unseen mysteries of grace, otherwise hid from the foundations of the world. It sets before us the divine constitution of this order of grace in the kingdom of heaven, now at hand to save men. Yielding to its conditions freely, as submissive children in the arms of our Almighty Lord, we become His disciples and He confers on us sacramentally (the only way He has promised) the powers of His salvation—including, of course always, the only merits of His suffering, death, resurrection and mediation, which give us righteousness and justification.

Vitally joined with the life and faith of Christ, the whole habit and tenor of the Christian's life will be, by faith; bearing fruits and good-works. Communicating to us the power of the life and faith of Christ, in which we are thus made par-

takers, we have the wondrous fruits of faith. It is not therefore a mere wonder-working of magic; but a supernatural miracle-working power. Objective faith works in us from Christ's life, through the Holy Ghost; and, by this heavenly power now at hand for us, "since faith is come," we repent, and believe, and obey. Then the subjective faith of the individual disciple will be the out-growth, springing from the life of the "True Vine," of which the believer is now a living branch partaking of the divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4). Bearing the image of the heavenly, Christ is formed in him the hope of glory; and the life is hid with Christ in God, so that the life he now lives in the flesh, he lives "by the faith of the Son of God."

Repentance, godly sorrow that needeth not to be repented of; hearty trust, the child-like confidence of love; hope, the anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, that taketh hold of that within the veil; and penitent, contrite, submissive obedience to the will of God, may now find place unto life and salvation. Now the believer apprehends that by which he has already, in the faith of Jesus Christ, been apprehended (Phil. iii. 12). The divine power of Christian love is now the mainspring of every action. Precisely in this does the life of a believer, that is, one under the divine order of faith, differ from an unbeliever, that is one who has not this supernatural grace, or organ of divine endowment, to receive and understand the mysteries of the gospel. An unbeliever, that is, an infidel, is a bald negation of the highest truth of man's being. Rationalism is only of earth earthy.

Human exercise of an active faith, the supernatural endowment, implanted by divine grace in the soul, must go out towards an object. Holding the supernatural contents of the Creed, there will be subjective acts of belief, receiving as verities the sum of the Gospel revelation. This produces formal acts of obedience of faith; man meanwhile feeling, owning and freely obeying, the unseen powers of the world to come. The mysterious contents of our faith, become real to us in the active exercise of this divine grace.

The Gospel which Paul preached was "THE Faith in Christ"

(Acts xxiv. 24). This is more than indefinitely "faith in Christ," as it is commonly presented by preachers. Jesus commissioned Paul to bear the blessings of Gospel grace to the Gentiles, by virtue of the faith that is lodged in Jesus' own life (Acts xxvi. 18), and because of which, they might be sanctified and saved by believing in Him.

This same Gospel, especially its Scriptural sum, in the Apostles' creed challenges our faith, and calls it into saving activity. We thereby hold for truth the Doctrine of Christ's Gospel revealed "from faith to faith" (Rom. i. 17.) In the broad ground of the Faith of Christ, we have faith in God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. This faith in us cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. The Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts, by the *preaching* of the Gospel and confirms it by the *use* of the sacraments. The Church is the divine human bearer of all this to lost and ruined man.

Deep and solemn as are the heavenly mysteries of the articles of our undoubted Christian Creed, they are within the compass and grasp of even child-faith. Indeed only on this plane can any one come to a proper apprehension of the kingdom of heaven. We must all receive it in the humble spirit of a little child.

Just as we "understand by faith that the worlds were made," without knowing *the how*, by any process of reasoning; so, the mysteries of the Incarnation, the mystery of the Trinity, and the mysteries of the holy Sacraments, are for the apprehension of faith; not for rationalism. All the divinely supernatural contents of the Christian Faith, all the verities of the Gospel system, are in the Creed. We believe the Creed; and that is the formal expression of the sum of our faith. But the creed itself only *rules* our faith objectively; it never *creates* that for us, but holds direct relation to the ground, the principle, the source, the fountain of faith—the faith of Christ.

The Faith of the Son of God is therefore at all points and ever, for us, the ground of our spiritual life; into which we are regenerated by the Holy Ghost in the use of the means of grace, the Word and Sacraments.



But since this faith itself is the gift of God in the grace of our Lord Jesus, is there not wrong done those who have not that heavenly power in saving efficacy? Not if the evangelical command to become "obedient to the faith," "repent and believe the gospel," (Mark i. 15,) presupposes the possible possession of this grace; because the kingdom of heaven is now at hand helping men to its benefits. Unto all to whom the challenge comes, by the Church in the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments, is there, in the redemptive life of the God-man, sufficient ground and possibility for individual personal faith. To him that hath, shall, most truly here be given; and from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath. The most damning sin of unbelief is just in this divine fact, THAT FAITH IS COME, and they now can, but *will not* believe. God has made it possible for men in Christ to be saved by faith; but they will not obey God's conditions of repentance, faith, baptism and doing what He commands the Church to teach them; but proudly refuse to exercise faith, and so despise His grace. Shall *their unbelief* make the *faith* (of whom?) of God," (that is the objective principle of salvation), "without effect" (Rom. iii. 3). Nay: that faith exists outside of individual man, with all its saving power, and needs only be embraced by those it first apprehends—and it saves.

Yielding ready and free obedience to the will of God, having a childlike spirit of docile submission to His guidance, and falling in hearty trust into His compassionate arms of mercy, is what God requires of us, in order to be saved. Only do not resist His Spirit, and He will regenerate us in Christ. Just let God work faith in our hearts, and He gives us power to believe unto righteousness and make confession unto salvation (Rom. x.). This is especially true of the children of the covenant. If they only do not *break the covenant*; or by a carnal heart of unbelief, make the covenant grace of God, as to themselves, of non-effect—they will be saved. As long as they are truly enfolded in the arms of our mother, the Church, they are safe. He that shows his faith in obeying the voice of the Church, which is to him the voice of Christ, calling him to believe and

be baptized and do what He has commanded, shall be saved by the faith of the Son of God.

Faith in the soul of man therefore rests in the broader ground of the faith of Christ; it is comprehended in the element of the life of our blessed Mediator, whose redeeming power in the sphere and order of grace is the kingdom of heaven now at hand. This teaches concerning "THE FAITH IN CHRIST." The human soul, by the power of this endowment of God, is brought within the reach and influence of this life-imparting mystery, the Incarnation, the life of the God-man. This "undying fact" is the ground, the primal source, the springing fountain life of our faith. We receive this "great fact of Christ's advent in the flesh," with all its divine contents by faith; which joins us in full union with the new life and gracious Person of the God-man. And this now is the element in the new creation in which we live and move. In this objective and historical sense we confess our faith in the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, "after the power of an endless life."

Here we find an order of existence above mere nature. To be brought into vital union and fellowship with it, is more than can be done by mere flesh and blood. The new birth, by water and the Spirit transfers us from the order of nature into the order of grace; where we are put in communication with the life of the supernatural world. In this is the domain of Faith: just as sense and reason rule in the lower sphere of Nature. We, thus believing, yield ourselves, to the authority of God's victorious grace, "to accomplish its saving work upon us in its own way."

Christian life in us becomes Christ-like, because the life of Christ is our life. Under the power of "the faith of Him," we are therefore to live the life that we now live in the flesh. It gives us here a supernatural principle, a miraculous power, which enables us to conquer the flesh, the world and the devil. This victory is the divine fruit of our faith; and our faith believes that JESUS IS THE CHRIST—that God is come in the flesh (1 Jno. v. 1-5).

This view of faith, in its fontal and objective character,

though somewhat peculiar, is nevertheless, as is indeed quite apparent from the force of the proofs given, *SCRIPTURAL*. That it is not common, and has not prominently prevailed in the general theological thinking of the age, is at first indeed a grave occasion for reflection as to its validity. In the Reformation conception of the great and cardinal doctrine of faith, there remains, however, yet wide room for normal development on the attainments of the past. Must we be shut up, at all points by the limits of old conceptions; or, may there be freedom for the true Bible liberty of the scribe, who like a householder, bringeth forth out of his treasures things both *new* and old?

No special need at the present time, calls for the bringing out of the subjective side of faith, as it holds in the human factor. For while we cannot indeed just say, that there is too much account made of that view of faith; yet it may be so viewed, from the standpoint of the mere human exercise of it, as to lose in large degree firm hold on the only true foundation of its divine human power. Human faith is only faith at all, as that comes from the Divine human, holding its centre in the Person of Christ.

By referring the ground of faith entirely, as modern thought is prone to do, to the soul of *MAN*, rather than to the life of the *GOD-MAN*, we may come to hold its principle after all, to be only natural, instead of supernatural.

The *faith of man* *IN man*, mere human credit, resting in a human object, is *humanitarianism*. This is too common in our age; and its moral reforms, and human perfectibility schemes, need to be opposed steadily by the true Faith of Christianity.

The *popular faith of man, in the Bible*, only natural belief in a true record, so far as human reason can receive it, is running our popular thinking with tremendous velocity, into *historical rationalism*. Here indeed the letter killeth. There is therefore crying want for "the grace of God which bringeth salvation." The good fight of true faith, must be fought on this line.

The *faith of man in nature*, a sort of human trust in the available uses of the external world, or man's life striving to perfect

itself in the mastery of the powers of nature, is *materialism*. Its chief aim is the subjugation of the mighty forces of material nature, to the use of man. This to be attained, is the highest good of its false prophets. This needs therefore to be challenged with the more real powers of supernatural grace and truth.

Then, finally, *the faith of man in the all divinity of the universe*, human faith holding all things to be divine, God in every thing, and from all things in sum, making its God, is *pantheism*. There is more of this at work in the thinking of our times, than is perhaps generally understood. Unconsciously entering into popular theories, its virus works all the more fatally in making shipwreck of the faith. The truth as it is in Jesus is its only complete corrective and cure.

It is not therefore mere speculative thinking, that seeks for the true principle and fountain source of objective Christian Faith, the apprehension and appropriation of the atoning merits of Christ, in His own Divine Human Person. Only when holding in this central ground can our faith, the justifying principles "revealed from (His) faith to (our) faith." (Rom. i. 17) become for us, an efficacious power to save. "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and THE FAITH OF JESUS." (Rev. xiv. 12).

## ART. IX.—ALTAR AND PRIEST.

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, A. M.

There has been really but one altar, and but one priest, in the whole history of fallen man. That altar is the cross, and that priest is Christ. Before Him there were altars and priests only in the sense of *preparation*; after Him, only in the way of *participation*.

The cross is the only real altar, because on it alone was offered to God for sin such a satisfaction precisely as the nature of the case required—and Christ is the only real priest, because it was He alone that offered it. Taking it for granted that man is unable to render this satisfaction by himself, but must do it by another, let us look at the things which are required of this substitute, both by man's fallen condition, and by the eternal justice and truth of God, to discover if these are not realized for the first and only time, in the offering up of Jesus Christ once for all. In the first place it is required that the substitute enter into the very constitution of man's being, fallen and sinful as it is, and by virtue of this union, though personally guiltless, actually bear his sins and infirmities. The same nature that sinned must likewise make satisfaction for sin. Since by man came death, by man must come also the resurrection from the dead. The birds and beasts, therefore, whose blood was shed on many an ancient altar, could not possibly bear in themselves, being of another nature, the sin of man. This is a first and fundamental reason why it is not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin. They cannot have it upon them to take away. The substitution of an animal without blemish, and the laying of their hands upon its head, confessing their sins, was to the Jews but an expression of their faith, dark and

dim though it were, in Him, who, though divine, took unto Himself our nature in its fallen condition, and thus also our sins. Of Him alone, being flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, can it be really said, "He bare our sins in his own body on the tree, he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, he who knew no sin was made sin for us." The view that He bore our sins merely in the way of sympathy, or by an arbitrary outward imputation, is wholly excluded (Hebrews ii. 14-17). Our sins were laid upon Him when He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. Though free from personal guilt, He bare these sins of ours, all His holy life, from the manger to the cross.

It is required of man's substitute, in the second place, to suffer and die, in such way that the effect thereof may be the perfection of its own nature. The object of divine love cannot be the mere shifting of sin from one to another, but must be its entire abolition. Sin and its consequences being overcome, there is room for the development to perfection of the original life. This, it seems, cannot be effected but by pain and death. Sin and suffering go together. God Himself has so constituted things. He did not arbitrarily appoint, but simply announced, death as the penalty of man's transgression. "In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." So also after man's disobedience and fall, the justice of God is satisfied not by witnessing merely the shedding of another's blood, including the pain and death involved therein, but by the state into which man's nature is brought by such shedding of blood. "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Thus was it intimated already in the Jewish dispensation that the object or design of sacrifice was to bring our nature into such condition as was pleasing to God. That state, however, was but the subjective one of contrition, as the Psalmist said, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."



But it is just here where again Jewish sacrifices substantially failed. As the animal had not the nature of man, and could not really bear his sin; so neither could it, by any process it passed through, bring that nature to a state of freedom from sin and of perfection. Though it suffered and died, though its blood was sprinkled upon the altar, and though it thus brought the sincere worshipper to a sorrow for sin, yet it never rose from its death with its own life perfected, much less with the life of man which it never possessed. This is an essential part of the reason why it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. But Christ is alone the true Lamb of God that really takes away the sin of the world, because He not only took upon Him our nature, and with it our sins, but also suffered and died, and, by His passion and death, brought, in the divinely mysterious connection of things, that nature in Himself, through His resurrection from the dead, to a state of perfection and glory. The Son of God, having once freely and mercifully taken our fallen nature unto Himself, must needs suffer if He wished to carry out His mission in the world, because of the connection, to us inscrutable, between sin and death. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" He, who carried our sin, also both put it away by the sacrifice of Himself, and at the same time Himself became perfect through His sufferings. This is the very language of the Holy Scriptures. So that when our Saviour rose from the dead, He arose with a humanity free from all the effects of the fall, with a humanity that now, after a brief season of perhaps further development, as well as of manifestation, was fitted to go into the very presence of the Father in all the glory of His eternal holiness and justice.

It is required of man's substitute, in the last place, not only to bear the nature and sin of man, as also to put away the sin and to purify that nature in its own perfection, but likewise to be able to impart its own now complete life to those in whose behalf it was sacrificed. The end is reached not simply by the perfection of the substitute, but by the perfection also of those for whom the substitute was provided. For this reason also it

is impossible for bulls and goats, which, when once killed, never rose again to impart a new life, to take away sins. Such sacrifices could never make *the comers* thereunto perfect. Such necessity was typified, but only typified, and perhaps unconsciously acknowledged by the Jews, when they *partook of the flesh* of the lamb that was offered in sacrifice to God. But when the Lamb of God died for our sins, He arose again to bestow upon us righteousness and life (Romans iv. 25). Before His death, he was not in a condition to communicate Himself substantially to His disciples. This He taught them plainly. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The Saviour, by His most holy passion, and death, and glorious resurrection, carried our humanity into such a state that it can now be re-communicated to all believers. Being *Himself made perfect*, He became the Author of salvation unto all them that obey Him (Hebrews v. 7-9). By the operation of the Holy Ghost, the power of the Saviour's life is imparted to believers, by virtue of which they are in Him new creatures, old things having passed away, and all things become new. When this work in them is by Him through the appointed means fully accomplished, then will they be like Jesus Christ, and fit to enter with Him into the immediate presence of God, in which is fulness of joy, and to go to His right hand, where there are pleasures forevermore.

Such being the overwhelming force of a real sacrifice for sin, the CROSS, upon which it was offered, that is, upon which His sufferings, commenced at His conception, were concentrated and "finished," is THE ALTAR of humanity. It is here where the idea of sacrifice is absolutely realized. It is to this that must be referred all remission of sin and reconciliation to God. Well may St. Paul exclaim, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

If this is the altar, it is not difficult to answer the question, Who is the Priest? It can be no other than He, who so freely offered Himself upon it, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

He is the priest, because it was by the free determination of His own will that He emptied Himself of divine glory, took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and when found in fashion as a man, every step in life was a free act of obedience, patiently submitting Himself even to the death of the cross. The temptation to turn from this course was real. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." In Him victim and priest are one. Through the sacrifice which He alone offered, can sin be pardoned. There never was, nor will there ever be, a Priest like Him. He hath an unchangeable priesthood, because He continueth forever. No man can come to God but by Him, and every one is invited to come by Him to God.

The sacrifice of Christ is of universal force, reaching out in all directions, and intended to benefit men of every age and race, who have come under the power of the Fall. Yet it was four thousand years before the altar, upon which it was offered, was erected—it has been eighteen centuries since. In what way did men before, and in what way do men since the incarnation, come under the power of the sacrifice made once for all? We answer, by means of ordinances appointed by God, and of men chosen by Him to administer them. Although both, to possess any value, must have direct reference to Christ, yet must the ordinances appointed before, having reference to a Christ to come, be essentially different from those appointed after, having reference to a Christ that is actually come. What is the difference?

The difference specifically is the same as that which obtains in general between the Old Dispensation and the New. Failure to recognize the true relation and yet the essential difference between these two Dispensations is the rock on which many theologically split. They are most frequently regarded as occupying the same level in the economy of man's salvation. Yet

the Scriptures are clear in inculcating that the New is as high above the Old, as Christ, the Mediator of the one, is above Moses, the mediator of the other. "Moses gave you not that true bread from heaven: but my Father giveth you the true bread (Christ) from heaven." He that is least in the kingdom of heaven, actual entrance into which is possible only under the New Dispensation, is greater than all the Old Testament prophets and saints. Before the manifestation of the Word in the flesh, and His consequent atonement, all could only have been *shadow*—since that time on, all must be *substance*. The one was a period of preparation, the other of possession.

Of the ordinances and ceremonies of the old law, that of sacrifice was one of central significance. It must therefore partake in an eminent degree of the preparative and shadowy nature which belongs to the whole dispensation. The central ordinance of the New Testament is confessedly the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It must therefore partake preëminently of the substantial character of that dispensation. It stands for that reason on a higher level, because in a closer relation to Christ crucified, than all the sacrifices of Jewish priests. If indeed the sacrifice of a Jewish lamb possessed value in itself, and altogether independent of the sacrifice of Christ, then might it well be regarded as of more significance and power than the Lord's Supper, which is of value only in virtue of its connection with the one sacrifice on the cross. But this view would be taking Christ out of His true position as *the Head* of humanity, and ignoring His name as the only one given under Heaven among men whereby must be saved not merely ourselves but men of every age and nation. It cannot be for a moment held. The only significance of Jewish sacrifice, as we have previously seen, consists in its preparation for the real sacrifice, and in its being the means of giving the people an interest in that sacrifice which was to come, merely in the way of faith and hope. Neither was the Jewish sacrifice a real sacrifice, nor is the Holy Eucharist, as Romanists at present hold. But both possess a sacrificial character, because of their reference to the sacrifice of Christ. Inasmuch now as possession is better than hope, and

a Saviour present of more force than a Saviour promised, the Lord's Supper, which has to do with the former, possesses *more of a sacrificial character*, than Jewish sacrifice, which has to do merely with the latter. Were it not so, why was the one abrogated, and the other put in its stead? Having new bottles shows the presence of new wine. When the Saviour ate of the paschal lamb for the last time, He transformed this into something different, and for that very reason higher, by giving His disciples bread and wine to eat and drink, which was the communication, as St. Paul says, of His own body and blood. In the one feast they partook of a typical lamb, in the other they were to partake of the true Lamb. For in the institution of the latter the Saviour said, "Take, eat; this is *my* body, which is broken for you. This is *my* blood of the *New Testament*, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." If indeed, in the face of these solemn divine words, Christians choose to rob this ordinance of its substantial reference to Christ, and make it a mere empty memorial of a sacrifice, the force of which to put away sin is not present, they are in danger of following in the tracks of their prototypes, the Jews, who robbed their ordinance of even its typical reference to Christ, and offered mere vain oblations; and as they by this misuse were gradually drawn into such a state as not to be able to recognize and receive the Saviour at His first coming, so there may be danger of their antitypes, by a similar misuse, failing in the power of discerning and acknowledging the Saviour at His second coming. There may be Pharisees and Sadducees among Christians at that great day.

Neither of them is an *altar* in the real sense, but if the place on which Jewish sacrifices were offered, could in any sense be so denominated, much more does the name appropriately belong to the place, on which are laid and consecrated the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. This altar may be constructed in whatever shape or form you please; you may have a box, or bracket, or an ordinary table; you may build it of iron, wood or marble. That is not a matter of the greatest importance. Still the idea of altar calls for an outward form or shape pecu-

liarily its own. This the first Christians were not in a condition to realize at once, just as at first also they had no church buildings, but worshipped in private houses, or wherever else they could quietly assemble together. Afterwards, when they could have churches, it was felt that they should be of a certain style of architecture peculiar to the Christian idea of worship, and different from buildings used for purposes of the world. So at first no doubt ordinary tables were used, but afterwards such as corresponded to the particular idea. We could not expect therefore in the New Testament any mention of *altar* as a place on which to lay the visible elements of the Lord's Supper, as indeed we find *no name whatever* mentioned as connected with such place, except in two instances. The Saviour, in the institution of the Sacrament, took the elements from the table at which they were celebrating the paschal feast, because that was the time and place in which the Passover was superseded by the Holy Eucharist. St. Paul also speaks of the Lord's table, and the table of devils (1 Cor. x). But it is to be remarked that in both these instances the idea of altar must have been present in the minds of those concerned. For the paschal lamb, whose flesh was laid on the table, was slain at the altar and its blood sprinkled thereon, so that at the table they partook of the altar. Also St. Paul, in the passage above referred to, in speaking of the Holy Communion, "represents it not as a sacrifice, as Roman Catholics maintain, but clearly as a sacrificial repast, as is shown distinctly by the parallel of analogous usages among Jews and Gentiles." The idea was there, if not the name. When we recall to mind that the early Christians celebrated the Communion every Lord's day, that the memory of the dreadful night in which it was appointed must have ever accompanied the disciples, that Paul so solemnly warns against the danger of becoming guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, we cannot but feel that it must have been regarded as of central significance, and of most solemn force and power. Being so regarded, it was but natural and legitimate that, as they began to possess regular church buildings, the worship therein should centre and fix itself upon the altar. So now we need to



have our altars restored in our churches, and constructed in such way as to be true to the idea which calls for them. If the closet, the family altar, or any other place where important events occur, is a consecrated spot, much more is that in which all our worship centres, and where we make the nearest approach to Christ this side heaven.

In the same sense in which there are *altars* in the Christian church, there must also be *priests*. Altar and priest are correlative terms. Where there is an altar, there must be a priest; where there is a priest, he must have an altar.\* Jewish altars had Jewish priests, and Christian altars must have Christian priests. There must be too the same difference between these several priests as there is between the altars at which they respectively minister, involving, as they do, the essential difference between the two dispensations in which they severally stand. Christ Jesus being the only real Priest, Christian ministers, who occupy a substantial relation to Him, are possessed decidedly of a more priestly character than Jewish priests, who only helped to prepare the way for His coming.

The question, Who are to minister at the altars which are called for and actually found in the Christian church? cannot be answered by saying, all God's people as members of the universal Christian priesthood. And for this simple and plain reason, *they have particular altars of their own, at which to fulfil their office of priesthood*. Ministers and people alike, as together constituting "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," are, as a part of their functions, "to present themselves daily living sacrifices of thankfulness to God;" "to offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually;" "to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ;" "to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, their reasonable service." But all this does not meet the wants of the case. Besides these universal altars there are, as we have seen, special altars, which require

---

\* The Episcopal Prayer Book, with strange inconsistency, recognizes priests, but not altars. Better *altar* and *minister* (in which term the idea of priest is included) than *table* and *priest*.

special priests. There is a Baptism to be administered, a public worship in the Sanctuary to be headed, most of all, a Holy Supper to be dispensed. Who are to attend to these things? Everybody? It was not so in the old covenant. There they had the universal priesthood, too. God, by Moses, proclaimed to all the Jews: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; and ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests and a holy nation*." Notwithstanding all this, they had special priests, who had such duties to fulfil that it was death to any one else who should attempt to do them. The universal priesthood of the Jews, which consisted in obeying the voice of God, and keeping His covenant, was continued until it was caught up in the higher universal priesthood of Christian believers, which consists in a real offering of themselves to God on the basis of a vital union with Him through Jesus Christ. So the special priesthood of Jewish priests, which consisted in sacrificing at typical altars, was superseded by the higher special priesthood of Christian ministers, which consists in serving at the substantial altars of the Gospel. All Christian people are *prophets*, too, and *kings*, as well as priests. As such, they have to "confess His name, and, with free conscience, fight against sin and the Devil in this life, and hereafter, in eternity, reign with Him over all creatures." Yet these duties on their part do not obviate the necessity of having *special prophets* to occupy the pulpit, and authoritatively preach all the words of this life, and *special kings*, to manage and control the general affairs of the church and congregation. "Are *all* apostles? are *all* prophets? are *all* teachers?" that is, in the special sense? Nay, the very object of special prophets and kings is to bring about and promote the prophetic and kingly character of the whole body of believers, as it is written: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the ful-

ness of Christ." In like manner, the special priesthood is in order to the universal priesthood. While on the one hand the persons that enter into the special proceed from the universal, on the other the universal without the special could not be maintained. It is in virtue of what the special is divinely authorized and commissioned to do, that believers enter upon and perform their functions as priests. The universal, including ministers and people alike, is the ultimate end, and the special is its servant. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," through the means of grace administered by the persons appointed (Eph. iv. 11-13, as quoted above), "and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever." Christ Himself, after His incarnation, became what He now is, by that which He did and suffered. He became a servant to Himself, and thus to humanity. "He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." In the Jewish economy the priests offered sacrifice both for their own sins and for the sins of the people. In the New Testament something is done in a divinely appointed way by divinely appointed men, by which such vital interest is effected in the one sacrifice of Christ that both people and ministers equally and alike are made partakers of the perfection of their common Redeemer. Ministers are servants both to their people and themselves. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."

It is often said that the people are privileged to go directly to God, by faith and prayer, without the intervention of any human priest but Christ.\* When this is said, it is said under the false impression that a priest is one who *stands in the way* of their direct approach to Him. Whereas it is the opposite that is true: a priest is one whose sole object is *to bring the*

---

\* If the priesthood of Christ does away with the idea of a *special* priesthood, it does away also with the idea of a *universal*. For Christ, being the only real Priest, has performed *all the duties* of the office, why then should there be priests now of any kind?

*people directly to God.* Jesus Christ, our great High Priest, did not appear for the purpose of preventing the coming of men to God, but of bringing them into His very presence! Yet, in the way of making satisfaction for sin, no mortal could come into the presence of God as He did. Jewish priests were appointed not to be hindrances, but helps to the people in their approaches to the Lord their God. While none but themselves could come before God, as far as their priestly functions were concerned, yet, by those very ministrations, they and their people together enjoyed the special presence and favor of God. Christian priests are not intended to keep the people from direct access to God through Christ, by faith and prayer, but so to minister unto their spiritual wants as *to enable them properly and the more fully to do so.* That which they do to help them can, of course, be done only by themselves, as Christ appointed, and "no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that was called of God, as was Aaron." Yet what they do finds its ultimate end only in bringing themselves and people into the most intimate union and communion with God. Faith and prayer are impossible to those who despise the ordinances of God. It is vain for a man to think he enjoys the favor of God by faith, who refuses to be baptized; it is vain for a man to attempt to pray, who fails to observe the command of the Lord: "Do this, in remembrance of me," and neglects the assemblies of the saints. Men can come into the presence of God, by faith and prayer, only when they are faithful to the ministrations of His Church, and when, like the three thousand converted on the day of Pentecost, they "continue steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

Those who are to administer these means of grace in the Christian Church are more decidedly appointed, set apart, and established in their succession, than those who offered sacrifice in the Jewish. God, by Moses, called Aaron to be His priest, but God, by His Son in the flesh, called the apostles to be His ministers. God ordained that Aaron's sons, by natural generation, should perpetuate the priesthood until Shiloh came;

God ordained that the Apostles should, by a spiritual succession, through the laying on of hands, perpetuate the ministry until the end of time. A minister of the Word, once lawfully called to his office, is bound to continue in the service of the sanctuary as long as he lives, giving himself wholly to the work, and not permitted to devote himself to a secular calling without permission of the Church."

But it may be said that the New Testament nowhere calls ministers of the Gospel *priests*. Be it so. There is a very good reason. The three important functions to be performed in behalf of sinful man are the prophetic, the priestly, the kingly. But when these are really fulfilled, they are *inseparable*. Christ Jesus is the Prophet, Priest, and King of humanity, but being such by the very constitution of His person, while we may theoretically, we cannot actually, separate His ministry into three distinct classes. Going back, however, to the days of types and shadows, we witness the three offices springing up as the times demanded, and filled by distinct classes of men, all *because* the shadow was there and not the substance. Now, in the Christian dispensation, the offices, being united or flowing together in Christ, are in the same character perpetuated in the Christian ministry, and therefore inseparable. For this reason we could not expect ministers to be called priests, thus ignoring their prophetic and kingly functions. Neither are they, nor could they properly be called *prophets* (in the sense of ordinary teachers), or *kings*. If it were true that the great and exclusive work of ministers was to *preach the Gospel*, as generally represented, we could reasonably expect the name of *prophet* to be their scriptural title. But priests are they no less called than prophets. And it must be remarked that neither priest, nor prophet, nor king is the distinctive name of Him who is all these in one, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, our Lord. The Apostles were called neither prophets, nor priests, nor kings, though they united in themselves this threefold office. If they were to fulfil the duties only of prophet and king, in order to carry on the work of Christ in those forms, and not to fulfil at the

same time the duty of priest, in order to carry on the work of Christ in that form, we would then have a religion prepared to *teach* and ready to *reign*, but not fitted to *atone* and *renew*. To announce salvation in Christ, without the capacity of administering the means of *participation*, would be cruel—to hope to manage or control the affairs of a church without members, would be absurd. To denominate ministers exclusively either *priests*, as in the Roman church, or *preachers*, as in some Protestant churches, is one-sided and unscriptural. Because forsooth, the Apostle Paul was an eminently successful preacher, and stated on one occasion that he was thankful, because of party strife, that it so occurred that he had himself baptized but a few that it might not be said he had baptized in his own name, it does not follow, nor can it be asserted, that on that account he set aside or undervalued the priestly function of his ministry.

While we make due account of the prophetic and kingly in Christianity, let us not rob ourselves of the priestly. The exercise of the prophetic requires more talent, and is therefore more showy, but let it not on that account overshadow the easy and plain.\* Let the altar stand, and bear upon it the sacramental signs and seals of the presence of the once crucified but now exalted Saviour; let the Minister of the Lord stand at its side and administer to us therefrom the bread and water of life, as he also from the same place causes the incense of our prayers to ascend to heaven, until Christ be visibly present, and we shall all alike reign with Him as kings and priests to our God forever.

---

\* This is no doubt a reason of the tendency in the human mind to exalt the prophetic, at the expense of the priestly function of the ministry. In preaching, there is room for the display of the most varied learning and all the powers of oratory, by which the minds of men are captivated and spell bound. It is here that ministers are called upon to exert all the talents, which Heaven has bestowed upon them, in arousing men and leading them to the cross. It is here alone that they make a name and rise in the estimation of the world, whether intentionally or unintentionally. But for this there is no room whatsoever in their priestly ministrations. To sprinkle a little water upon a person's head, to bless and distribute a little bread and wine is simple, incapable of variation, and done in short time. Yet who does not know that the mightiest results spring sometimes from the most simple causes?



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN THE INSPIRATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. By T. F. Curtis, D.D., late Professor of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Pa. Published by Appletons.

Prominent among the distinctive features of the Baptist denomination are the slight value it attaches to creeds, and the high estimate it places upon the letter of the Scriptures. How closely these two principles lie to the heart of the Baptist system, it is not difficult to see. Accordingly, where either of them is in any measure abandoned, we naturally expect a departure from that exclusiveness with which, as a denomination, Baptists are charged.

Of this we have a remarkable illustration in the production before us. Not by any means that Dr. Curtis rejects immersion as the proper form of baptism, or expressly recognizes infant baptism as warrantable. He does go so far, however, as to say, that "if it should appear that Christian brethren of different denominations can increase their love and sympathy by partaking together of the Eucharist, instead of in their respective churches only, no ecclesiastical fetters should restrict them from doing so." This, now, does not say so much, certainly, as that infant baptism is in any sense valid, but this, at least, it does say, that a man may be included in the Christian brotherhood without being immersed.

Formerly Dr. C. held the exclusive theory, and vindicated it in a work published some years ago, entitled, the Progress of Baptist Principles. But his views on this subject have undergone a change, in common with those on the subject of Inspiration.

In handling this *locus* before his class, the author found himself involved in difficulty. The theory of the divine authorship of the Sacred Record, as held prevailingly by the preachers and theological teachers of this country, was, for him, untenable. Each successive recurrence to the topic, so far from leading him to a view which would be satisfactory to the denomination which supported the seminary, led him farther away. At last he resigns his professorship, and gives himself up to a thorough and independent investigation of the whole subject. The result of this, we have in the work before us.

Before entering into the discussion proper, Dr. Curtis gives us a bird's-eye view of the present state of opinion throughout the Church on this subject. This is pretty full and satisfactory, covering over seventy pages. We can here learn something of the opinion of nearly every prominent theologian of this century on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. But why does he confine himself to the present in giving us

this account? Surely modern theologians are not the only ones whose expression of view is worth listening to. Why not give us some insight into the history of the doctrine? It would be interesting for us to know, whether the early fathers regarded the Scriptures as infallibly dictated by the Holy Spirit; whether the Catholic Church ever set up any definite theory; how the school-men differed among themselves; to what extent uncertainty in regard to the precise nature of inspiration pervades the writings of the Reformers. We ought certainly to have been reminded of the fact, that the doctrine, as stated by the strictest teachers on the subject, took shape and form as late as the seventeenth century, when not only the formation of the canon, but the punctuation of the whole; including the Hebrew pointing, was declared to be absolutely infallible and divine. However, in what Dr. C. has given us, we have a fair presentation of almost all the different shades of view exhibited in modern theological literature, and this, probably, was deemed sufficient to prepare the reader for a candid consideration of a setting forth and vindication of the author's own views.

After the sketch just referred to, we find a classification of the various theories. In the first class are placed those which attribute to the Sacred Scriptures an absolute infallibility, not only so far as religious doctrine and practice are concerned, but in regard to matters of science and history. To the second belong those which allow historic and scientific matter to be colored by the age and opinions of the writer, but still claim infallibility for every statement specifically religious. Both of these theories are rejected; and then the author goes forward to show, that human error and infirmity are exhibited by the holy pensmen, in those precious writings which the Church has handed down to us as the Word of the living God.

In confirmation of his position, the author adduces a series of arguments, external and internal. The character of these are such as claim for themselves at least respectful consideration. The result of modern statistical investigation, the disclosures which geology makes in regard to the age of our globe and of the human race, belong to the first class. Among the internal arguments against infallibility, is the following: "No simple-minded reader would get the impression from the sacred writings, that their authors regarded themselves as absolutely exempted from error in their composition. On the contrary, the writers seem to speak as though they might possibly be in error. On page 315 we read as follows: 'The official apostolical books of the New Testament have in that fact the assurance of inspiration. But as the divine authority given to these men to establish Christian Churches did not render their spoken words infallible individually, and nothing of that sort was ever promised them, nor thus understood by themselves or by others around them, so the sacred writings, while containing in the aggregate a system of the highest divine authority and inspiration, are not to be considered as individually and perfectly faultless.'"

Our space does not allow us to say any more, either in the way of stating or weighing the author's arguments. What we wish to do (and this is what we principally had in view in noticing it), is to direct attention to the drift of the production. No one need be surprised that the Unitarians of New England at once claimed it as confirmative of their own rationalistic position. And it must be conceded that much beside what has already been told, looks like a tendency in that direction. We hear the author speaking of God's revelation of himself in nature, in human intuition, in providence, etc., as though he put all this on a par, in a religious point of view, with the teachings of the sacred Scriptures. Whilst occasional expressions of this kind strike us unpleasantly, there is much, on the other hand, which we read with delight. On page 281 we have the following: "But while holding most firmly to these writings as the production of men who 'spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and therefore worthy of our highest reverence, being guides of divine authority as a whole, and authentic expositions of Christianity, we shall best show our reverence for them by a love of the *exact truth* in regard to their composition, in preference to such an idolatry of the letter of Scripture, as must destroy the veneration the good man will ever feel for its essence and spirit." And soon afterward we see the avowal that his "object is just the opposite of rationalism." That this may be the case is clear from the fact, that the mechanical inspiration theory, which he mainly opposes, is erected on rationalistic principles. He wants something more substantial than such a purely logical structure as this, upon which to rest his faith. That Dr. Curtis' tendency is opposed to rationalism, we think no one will doubt after reading the following: "A proper view of this subject will lead to a higher reverence for the authority of Scripture, as the record of that ever-living body, the kingdom of God, and the Church of the redeemed, in which he lives and reigns who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. Perhaps then it might seem especially from some developments which have actually taken place, that the chief danger of these (his own) views may be found rather in a certain tendency to mysticism (such as we see in High Church Episcopacy, or in transcendentalism) than to rationalism. And here, again, all turns upon the meaning we attach to terms. For there must ever be, as the basis of every human belief, something that transcends the mere reasoning process, something that goes beyond and back of it, some basis of authority on which all reasoning is grounded."

Dr. Curtis identifies the Mercersburg view with that of Dr. Tholuck and Dr. Pusey, and says that "it asserts that the Church and the Bible are inspired in such a manner, that from the combined influence of the two, faithful souls shall receive a fully sufficient and divine guidance for each exigency, one of practical infallibility to those who have faith in it, if not theoretically infallible for all mankind. There are many shades of this opinion, and its depth and force are little understood." The book before us clearly shows, that the author is not

far from a clear understanding of "its depth and force." To show that he is greatly in advance, not only of his own denomination, but of the mass of American Protestantism on the point here touched upon, we will make the following extracts:—

"These views of the absolute infallibility of the written word (those which he is controverting) detract from the proper view and reverence for the Church as a practically inspired body. That there is a mystical body of Christ, in which he dwells and walks, and which justly claims great authority, the Scriptures plainly declare. In former ages, the Roman Catholic Church, with great plausibility, assumed to be alone that body, possessed of the keys, and as such to be infallible. The Protestants detected and exposed this error, but have many of them fallen into a worse, which is that the Church of Christ is not an *inspired* body, but a sort of voluntary society, or aggregate of such societies; only that and nothing more. The Church of Christ includes all who love and follow Him. And though the membership of it may be invisible to mortal eye, it acts with a visible and inspired power and authority upon each age, nation and community, leading it forward with a heavenly instinct and superior wisdom. There is the home of the Paraclete on earth. Thus all become in measure inspired with the presence of the Saviour, the life of God. Each individual Christian has the Spirit in degree, even alone, but he will also recognize a voice speaking to him through the Christian community with which he associates. . . . Notwithstanding the bickerings of sects and parties, the true Christian will love the Church of Christ as the Jerusalem which is from above and the mother of us all, free with her children from subjection to any undue authority, but guided by the animating spirit of Him who founded it. Rightly regarded, it utters not a mere verdict of the majority, but the voice of God in earth, asserting the foremost truths of each age to mankind, and inspiring men with the holy and loving thoughts of Christ's own nature. But a right practical view of the Church cannot, and does not, co-exist with a wrong and superstitious view of Scripture." Pp. 310 et seq.

Indications render it probable, that the Baptist denomination will repudiate this work of a former honored professor; but we hope that they will not be too fast. For we are convinced that they, with much of the rest of modern Protestantism, can learn many a lesson from it, which it will be profitable for them to ponder. We look upon it as one of the truly significant signs of the times. R.